00035604

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

THE CONQUEROR AND HIS COMPANIONS.

THE CONQUEROR

AND

HIS COMPANIONS.

366c4

BY

J. R. PLANCHÉ,
SOMERSET HERALD.

35-604ac

"We find but few historians of all ages who have been diligent enough in their search for truth. It is their common method to take on trust what they distribute to the Public, by which means a falsehood once received from a famed writer becomes traditional to posterity."—DRYDEN, *Character of Polybius.*

TTK5

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:
TINSLEY BROTHERS, 8, CATHERINE STREET, STRAND.
1874.

[*All rights reserved.*]

35604

LONDON:
BRADBURY, AGNEW, & CO., PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

Raoul de Gael, Earl of Norfolk—Hugh d'Avranches, Earl of Chester—Geoffrey de Mowbray, Bishop of Coutances—Roger de Mowbray (his brother) 1

CHAPTER II.

Richard de Bienfaite—Baldwin de Meules—Richard de Redvers —Gilbert de Montfichet—Roger le Bigod 33

CHAPTER III.

Humphrey de Bohun—Henry de Ferrers—Geoffrey de Mandeville—Hugh de Grentmesnil—Richard de Courci . . 63

CHAPTER IV.

William de Albini—William Malet—William de Vieuxpont—Raoul Taisson—William de Moulins—Hugh de Gournay . 90

CHAPTER V.

William de Mohun—Eudo al Chapel—Eudo Dapifer—Fulk d'Aunou—Richard de Nevil 120

CHAPTER VI.

Neel de Saint-Sauveur—William de Roumare—The Chamberlain of Tankerville—Urso d'Abitot—Walter and Ilbert de Lacy —Robert and Ivo de Vesci—Euguenulf de l'Aigle . . 110

CHAPTER VII.

Robert Marmion—Hugh de Beauchamp—William de Percy—Robert Fitz Erneis—William Patry de la Lande . . . 167

CHAPTER VIII.

William Crispin—Avenel de Biarz—Fulk d'Aulnay—Bernard de St. Valeri—Robert d'Oiley—Jean d'Ivri 191

CHAPTER IX.

Raoul de Fougeres—Errand de Harcourt—William Painel—Walter d'Aincourt—Samson d'Ansneville—Hamo de Crèvecœur—Picot de Say 225

CHAPTER X.

Robert Bertram—Hugh de Port—William de Colombières—Robert d'Estouteville—William Peverel 247

CHAPTER XI.

Companions of the Conqueror unidentified, or of whose personal history nothing has hitherto been discovered . . . 276

INDEX 303

THE CONQUEROR AND HIS COMPANIONS.

CHAPTER I.

RAOUL DE GAEL, EARL OF NORFOLK.
HUGH D'AVRANCHES, EARL OF CHESTER.
GEOFFREY DE MOWBRAY, BISHOP OF COUTANCES.
ROGER DE MOWBRAY (HIS BROTHER).

RAOUL DE GAEL, EARL OF NORFOLK.

"Joste la Compagnie de Neel,
Chevalcha Raoul de Gael."
Roman de Rou, l. 13,624.

HERE is another mysterious companion, respecting whom much labour and speculation have been expended in vain. All our historians are agreed upon the fact that the Consulate of the East Angles, comprising the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk and part of Cambridge, was given by William the Conqueror to one of his followers named Raoul, or Ralph, indif-

ferently designated Guader, Waher, Gwyder, Gael, Waite, Ware, and even Vacajet, so that it is almost difficult to believe the writers are all of them really speaking of the same individual.

This Raoul, however, who was one of the principal leaders of the Bretons in the great expedition of William, and received, as we are told, in reward of his services the earldoms of Norfolk and Suffolk, married, some say with the consent, others in positive defiance of, his sovereign, Emma, daughter of William Fitz Osbern, the great Earl of Hereford, and sister of his son and successor, Roger de Breteuil, and on his very wedding-day joined with his brother-in-law and Waltheof, Earl of Northumberland, in a plot against King William, which might speedily have terminated the reign of the Conqueror had not Waltheof, repenting almost in the same breath, denounced the conspirators, first to Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, and then, by his advice, to the King himself, who was at that time in Normandy. Roger, Earl of Hereford, was seized and thrown into prison, out of which he never came alive; but Raoul, Earl of Norfolk, fortunately escaped to Denmark. His wife heroically defended the Castle of Norwich until she could make honourable terms for herself and the Bretons under her command. Ralph, after ineffectually attempting an

inroad with some forces hastily raised in Denmark, retired to Brittany, where he found refuge and protection with Hoel V., Count of Brittany, and in 1075, on King William's laying siege to Dol, threw himself into the place with Alain Fergant, the son and successor of Hoel, and defended it valiantly against the royal forces. Eventually Raoul, with his brave and faithful Countess, made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, in which the mortal career of both is said to have terminated.

These few facts, stated in as few words, are to be found with little variation in all our English annalists, occasionally accompanied by a note or a parenthesis, containing an assertion or a suggestion respecting the parentage of this traitorous and ungrateful nobleman.

The Saxon Chronicle, which has been followed by some of the early historians, says, under date 1075, "This year King William *gave* Earl Ralph the daughter of William Fitz Osbern to wife. The said Ralph was Bryttisc (British) on his mother's side, and his father was an Englishman named Ralph, and born in Norfolk. The King, therefore, gave his son the earldoms of Norfolk and Suffolk, who then brought his wife to Norwich, but—

> "There was that bride-ale
> The source of men's bale.

"It was Earl Roger and Earl Ralph who were authors of that plot, and who enticed the Britons (Bryttens) to them, and sent each to Denmark after a fleet to assist them," &c.

In contradiction to the above statement, that the King *gave* to Earl Ralph the daughter of Fitz Osbern to wife, the majority of the Norman historians contend that the match was for unknown reasons strictly prohibited by the King; and in as positive opposition to the assertion that Earl Ralph was British on his *mother's* side, William of Malmesbury, who calls him Ralph de Waher, says he was a Briton on his *father's* side ("Brito ex-patre"), and of a disposition foreign to anything good. Matthew Paris and Matthew of Westminster both call *him*, and not his father, an Englishman born in Norfolk, and by his *mother's* side of British parentage, "which," says Dugdale, "they understand to be Welsh; but others say he was of Brittany in France, which is the more likely in regard he was the owner of the Castle of Guader, in that province." Here we begin to approximate the truth, for Guillaume de Jumiéges, in describing the issue of William Fitz Osbern, says that one of his daughters named Emma is married to Radulf de Waiet, "genere Britoni qui fuit comes Norwicensis;" and Wace, in his chronicle, says distinctly, "Next the company of

Neel rode Raol de Gael. He was himself a Breton and led Bretons. He served for the land he had, but he had it a short time enough, for he forfeited it as they say."

In the paper I read at the Norwich Congress of the British Archæological Association in 1857, I gave my reasons for believing Raoul de Gael to be a son of Ralf, Earl of Hereford, in the reign of Edward the Confessor, who is, I think, unfairly accused of cowardice in consequence of the flight of his troops, raw levies, hastily raised, and compelled to fight on horseback, to which they were unaccustomed, against the combined Irish and Welsh forces under Algar, son of Leofric, in 1055. I have seen nothing since to induce me to alter my opinion.

This Ralph was a son of Goda, sister of Edward the Confessor, by her first husband, Dreux, Count of the Vexin, of Pontoise, Chaumont, and Amiens, and nephew, consequently, of the English King. Sir Henry Ellis, in his Introduction to Domesday, has shown that the wife of Ralph is named in the survey as Getha and Gueth, who held lands in Buckinghamshire; but though identifying her as the mother of Harold, Lord of Sudeley, he does not allude to any other issue. The name of Getha is certainly not Norman, and we find her acknowledged son named

Harold, tending to show that she was of Saxon origin, which view is supported by entries in Domesday of a Godwin, "uncle of Earl Ralph," and an Alsio (Alsy), "nephew of Earl R.," holding land in the time of King Edward.

Ralph, who is called Earl of Hereford by the majority of the historians, is expressly described by the old Norman poet Gaimar as Earl of the East Angles. He tells us that Count Leuric (Leofric) held Norfolk, and that on his death Raoul (Ralph) was seised of his honour, but held it for a very short time, and was buried at Peterborough, then called Burgh, Count Leofric being buried at Coventry.

In Duchesne's list of the names of Normans who flourished in England before the Conquest, occurs "Ralph, *Comes Est Angliæ*, pater Heraldi dominus de Sudely," and in that of nobles living in the twentieth year of King William the Conqueror, "Radulfus, Comes Est Angliæ," is marked as "mortuus antea."

With all due deference, therefore, I cannot accept Mr. Taylor's suggestion, strongly enforced though it be by Mr. Freeman, that Raoul de Gael was the son of Ralph Stalra, or the Staller, nor can I consent to hear him branded as "the only English traitor in that motley host," who came to win back the lands "which some unrecorded treason had lost him." I protest against

this groundless accusation of a loyal and gallant soldier, who, in 1069, had repulsed an invasion of the Danes at Norwich while his sovereign was amusing himself with chasing the deer in the Forest of Dean. What are the words of Wace? "He served for the land. he had." Does this imply that he had previously forfeited it by treason? I think I can prove that he was a man "more sinned against than sinning."

Walter de Mantes, Ralph Earl of Hereford's eldest brother (according to my theory), was, together with his wife, Biota, basely poisoned at Falaise by William the Conqueror in 1065, in order to secure possession of the Comté of Maine, the reversion of which was, it is said, bequeathed to him by Biota's father after the decease of Hugh or Herbert, Walter claiming it in right of his wife, and being the popular candidate.

This infamous act is passed over in silence by most of the Norman historians, but Orderic Vital, in his account of the fatal "bride-ale" of Ixingham, where the conspiracy against William was formed by Roger de Breteuil and Raoul de Gael, represents the latter as making this double murder one of the charges against the Norman King of England, whom he accuses, and with good reason, of having also caused the poisoning of Conan, Duke of Brittany, and of other foul and tyrannical actions. "He who now bears the

title of King," the Earl is reported to have said, "is unworthy of it, being a bastard, and it is evident that it is unpleasing to God that such a monster should govern the kingdom.

"He disinherited and drove out of Normandy William Werlenc, Count of Mortain, for a single word. Walter, Count of Pontoise, nephew of King Edward and Biota, his wife, being his guests at Falaise, were both his victims by poison in one and the same night. Conan also was taken off by poison at William's instigation —that valiant Count whose death was mourned through the whole of Brittany with unutterable grief on account of his great virtues. These and other such crimes have been perpetrated by William in the case of his own kinsfolk and relations, and he is ever ready to act the same part towards us and our peers."

There is tolerable evidence that all these charges are well founded, at any rate they are not contradicted by Orderic, who recites them, and they have never been disproved, and if I am correct in my deductions, we have here a very strong justification of Raoul de Gael's rebellion, which has been represented by the partial Norman writers and their modern copyists as a monstrous piece of ingratitude.

Walter de Mantes and Biota were, according to my

opinion, the uncle and aunt of Raoul de Gael, and to Conan, Duke of Brittany, the Conqueror's other victim, Raoul would owe fealty for his possessions, Montfort and Guader, in that province; while to those in England he had naturally succeeded on the death of his father, the old Earl Ralph, and had consequently been rewarded by William for his assistance at the Conquest by confirmation only in his hereditary rights and dignity,—"the land," in fact, "which he had," and for which he did service.

Place this unavoidable act of justice, more than favour, in one scale, and the base assassination of his nearest relations and of his native feudal lord in the other, added to the imperious prohibition of his marriage with Emma, under perhaps the most aggravating circumstances, for no reasons were ever given, and we are justified in believing that William, a notorious promise-breaker, may have acted towards the Earl of Norfolk, as he had previously done towards Earl Edwin, to whom he had first promised his daughter, and then broke faith with him and drove him into rebellion. Weigh, I repeat, these injuries against a questionable boon, and I think you will agree with me, that the obligations of the Breton noble to the Norman sovereign dwindle down to a burden not very likely to have encumbered his conscience, even if

murder and tyranny could not legally as well as morally absolve him.

Who shall say that the very object of the astute tyrant in forbidding the match—evidently one of affection—was not to exasperate his too powerful vassals and drive them into rebellion, as he had previously done Edwin and Morkar, so that he might have a legal pretence, and of which he was always so cunningly careful, for seizing on their large domains in England,—of course the first thing he did do ?

The assertion that the elder Ralph was an Englishman, born in Norfolk, may not be untrue, for his mother, sister of Edward the Confessor, might have been in this country, and in that county, at the time of his birth; while on the other hand, the Countess Getha, or Gueth, was probably in Bretagne when Raoul was born, from which circumstance he might take the name of Gael, as having first seen the light in that castle.

Gael, spelt and pronounced Wael, on the same principle that Guillaume and Gulielmus became William and Willielmus, was anciently called Guadel, similarly softened into Wadel. The relics of St. Unwin were deposited in a monastery there. A further commutation of the final l for r, either by the Latin chroniclers or their careless transcribers, has transformed Wael into Waer, and Guadel into Guader.

The other varieties, Gader, Guaer, Waher, Ware, and Waiet are evidently errors either of the scribe or the printer, and Gwyder is obviously a guess originating in the tradition of a Welsh mother, which if Gueth be a corruption of Gwyneth is not to be hastily discarded, particularly when we remember her husband was Earl of Hereford. Vacajet, which occurs in "Neustria Pia," and once in Maurice's "Histoire de Bretagne," may be the name of some other lordship by which Raoul was occasionally called, as he appears as Ralph de Montfort and Ralph de Dol, both castles in Brittany belonging to himself or his family, and in the latter of which he was besieged by King William after his escape from Norwich. That he has not been mentioned as the brother of Harold, Lord of Sudeley,* need surprise no one who has any experience of the laxity of the old chroniclers on such matters. In the preceding volume many instances have been pointed out of their silence, either through ignorance or neglect of genealogical points, of equal, if not more importance. Few English antiquaries besides the late Mr. Stapleton have turned their serious attention to the investigation of the descents of the followers of the Conqueror, proud as thousands are of tracing up their pedigrees

* Harold was a minor in 1066, in ward of the Lady (Queen) Eadgyth. Raoul, according to my view, was his elder brother and in possession of his patrimonial estates in Brittany.

to them and through them to Charlemagne, while others delight in denouncing them as Richard III., according to Shakespere, does the followers of another fortunate invader,—"a scum of Bretons," and—

> "overweening rags of France,
> Who, but for dreaming on this fond exploit,
> For want of means, poor rats, had hanged themselves."

A mere horde, in fact, of military adventurers attracted by the prospect of plunder and power.

In the latter class we have hitherto been led to place Raoul de Gael, but if I have correctly affiliated him, the blood of Charlemagne *did* run in his veins, for his grandfather was the son of Alice, or Adele, daughter of Herbert, Count of Senlis,—a scion of a younger branch of the Counts of Vermandois, and with their blood was mingled that of the Saxon sovereigns of England, for he was the great-grandson of Ethelred, King of England.*

Royal lineage, however, would not advance him in the reader's estimation were he still stained with treason and branded with ingratitude. His rank would rather give a deeper dye to his delinquency. But in establishing his parentage according to my theory, a clear light is thrown upon his conduct. A rebel he

* Have we here by accident lighted on the unrevealed reason of the Conqueror's opposition to the marriage? Utterly to root out the royal Saxon race was his constant anxiety, and unscrupulously did he labour to effect his objects. What became of the younger brother, Harold?

undoubtedly was; but it was against a felon king, the dastardly assassin of Raoul's kinsfolk, whilst he was their host,—.

> " Who should against the murderer bar the door,
> Not bear the knife himself,"

and of a liege lord to whom the noble Breton was equally bound. It was against a faithless tyrant, who had abused the power to which he had helped to raise him, by flinging for some dark purpose a barrier between him and the chosen of his heart, for that his union with the daughter of Fitz Osbern was one of mutual affection is surely proved by her gallant defence of Norwich Castle whilst her husband was seeking aid from his friends in Denmark, and the ultimate pilgrimage of the Earl and Countess to Palestine, where they found a peaceful grave together.

By one of those remarkable circumstances which are popularly termed judgments, the city of Mantes proved fatal to the ferocious and perfidious Norman, and avenged the double murder of its rightful lord and his Countess Biota.

Raoul de Gael had by his Countess Emma three sons: the eldest, William, died in 1102, Raoul, who succeeded him, and Alain, who accompanied his father to Palestine and perhaps never returned. Raoul the second, also called De Gael, was taken into favour by

Henry I., King of England, to whose illegitimate son Richard he affianced his daughter Ita or Avicia, with the full consent of the King, who settled on her, as a marriage portion, the barony of Breteuil and the lands of Lire and Glos, which had belonged to her grandmother's family.

Richard was, however, drowned in the wreck of the White Ship, and Avicia afterwards espoused Robert de Beaumont, "Le Bossu" Earl of Leicester. Is it likely that the granddaughter of Ralph the Staller would have been proposed as a wife for the son of a king, even though illegitimate? Descended as I consider her to be, she was a match for the King himself. I will place this simple fact against a supposition founded on a single entry in Domesday, wherein Ralph the Staller is given the title of "Comes."* He was no doubt Comes Stabuli, and so were two other Stallers at the same period, Esgar and Bondy. But Raoul de Gael was, I contend, son of "Radulfus, Comes Est Angliæ," and not of an officer of the Royal Household, who cannot for a moment be placed in the rank of the "Master of the Horse" of the present

* "Benetleiam tenuit Comes Guert. T. R. E. posteam adjunxit. Comes Radulfus Stalra huic manerio pro berewita, T. R. Willelmi." A Ralf Regis "Dapifer" and a Ralf "Minister" appear as witnesses to charters of the same period, but they cannot be identified with Ralph the Staller. A "Radulphus Dapifer" was an under tenant in Northamptonshire. There are between thirty and forty Ralphs mentioned in Domesday, not one third of whom could be identified.

day, and whose title of "Comes" no more signified Earl than that of constable does the dignity of that great officer of state, "the Lord High Constable of England," though derived from the same root, the Count of the Stable. Raoul de Gael was a powerful baron of Brittany, lord of the Castles of Guader and Montfort * and large domains, which we are distinctly informed were his patrimonial estates, and could not be affected by his attainder in England, and to which his sons succeeded by hereditary right. Is there the slightest evidence that Ralph the Staller was ever Lord of Guader and Montfort, or of a rood of land in Brittany? The confusion has been caused by Ralph the Earl and Ralph the Staller having each a son Ralph, but there is this remarkable distinction, the son of the Earl is invariably styled *Comes*, whereas the son of the Staller, called "Comes," is simply named Ralph.

Ita or Avicia Countess of Leicester is incorrectly set down by our modern genealogists as the daughter and heir of Raoul Earl of Norfolk, for whom an arbitrary coat of arms has been invented which is quartered by many of our nobility. She was, as I have shown, his granddaughter, and not his heir; and neither he nor his son could ever have borne coat armour, which made its first appearance in the reign of Henry II.

* Montfort-sur-Mer, near Rennes.

HUGH D'AVRANCHES, EARL OF CHESTER.

Here is a personage who, under the more popular name of Hugh Lupus, is perhaps almost as well known as the Conqueror himself.

Wace in his "Roman de Rou," speaks only of his father Richard:

"D'Avrancin i fu Richarz."

But it is generally contended that Richard was not in the battle, and that it was Hugh, his son, who accompanied William to Hastings. The authors of "Les Recherches sur le Domesday," to whom we are so deeply indebted for information on these points, hesitate to endorse the opinion of Mons. le Prévost upon these grounds,—that Richard was living as late as 1082, when he appears as a witness to a charter of Roger de Montgomeri, in favour of St. Stephen's at Caen, to which also his son, Earl Hugh, is a subscriber. Their observations only point, however, to the probability of Richard, who in 1066 was Seigneur or Vicomte of Avranches, having been in the Norman army of invasion, as he survived the event some sixteen years; at the same time they deny that there is any proof that his son Hugh was in the battle, and assert, without stating on what authority, that Hugh only joined the Conqueror in England after the victory at Senlac,

when he rendered the new King most important services by his valour and ability in the establishment of William on the throne, and contributed greatly towards the reduction of the Welsh to obedience. That there is authority for their assertion appears from the cartulary of the Abbey of Whitby, quoted by Dugdale in his "Monasticon,"* where we read distinctly that Hugh Earl of Chester and William de Percy came into England with William the Conqueror in 1067: "Anno Domini millesimo sexagesimo *septimo*," and that the King gave Whitby to Hugo, which Hugo afterwards gave to William de Percy, the founder of the abbey there.

We have here, therefore, a parallel case to that of Roger de Montgomeri,† and must similarly treat it as an open question.

The descent of Richard, surnamed Goz, Le Gotz, or Le Gois, from Ansfrid the Dane, the first who bore that surname, has been more or less correctly recorded, but in "Les Recherches" it will be found critically examined and carried up to Rongwald, or Raungwaldar, Earl of Mære and the Orcades in the days of Harold Harfager, or the Fair-haired; which said Rongwald was the father of Hrolf, or Rollo, the first Duke of

* Mon. Ang. vol. i., p. 72.
† *Vide* vol i., p. 181.

Normandy. Rongwald, like the majority of his countrymen and kinsmen, had several children by a favourite slave, whom he had married "*more Danico*," and Hrolf Turstain, the son of one of them, having followed his uncle Rollo into Normandy, managed to secure the hand of Gerlotte de Blois, daughter of Thibaut Count of Blois and Chartres, which seems to have been the foundation of this branch of the great Norse family in Normandy, and the stock from which descended the Lords of Briquebec, of Bec-Crispin, of Montfort-sur-Risle, and others who figure as companions of the Conqueror.

The third son of Gerlotte was Ansfrid the Dane, the first Vicomte of the Hiemois, and father of Ansfrid the second, surnamed Goz, above mentioned, whose son Turstain (Thurstan, or Toustain) Goz was the great favourite of Robert Duke of Normandy, the father of the Conqueror, and accompanied him to the Holy Land, and was intrusted to bring back the relics the Duke had obtained from the Patriarch of Jerusalem to present to the Abbey of Cerisi, which he had founded. Revolting against the young Duke William in 1041,* Turstain was exiled, and his lands confiscated and given by the Duke to his mother, Herleve, wife of Herluin de Conteville.

Richard Goz, Vicomte d'Avranches, or more pro-

* *Vide* vol. i., p. 21.

perly of the Avranchin, was one of the sons of the aforesaid Turstain, by his wife Judith de Montanolier, and appears not only to have avoided being implicated in the rebellion of his father, but obtained his pardon and restoration to the Vicomté of the Hiemois, to which at his death he succeeded, and to have strengthened his position at court by securing the hand of Emma de Conteville, one of the daughters of Herluin and Herleve, and half-sister of his sovereign. By this fortunate marriage he naturally recovered the lands forfeited by his father and bestowed on his mother-in-law, and acquired also much property in the Avranchin, of which he obtained the Vicomté, in addition to that of the Hiemois.

There was every reason, therefore, that he should follow his three brothers-in-law in the expedition to England, if not prevented by illness or imperative circumstances. He must have been their senior by some twenty years, but still scarcely past the prime of life, and his son Hugh a stripling under age, as his mother, if even older than her brothers Odo and Robert, could not have been born before 1030, and if married at sixteen, her son in 1066 would not be more than nineteen at the utmost. Mr. Freeman, who places the marriage of Herleve with Herluin after the death of Duke Robert in 1035, would reduce this

calculation by at least six years, rendering the presence of her grandson Hugh at Senlac more than problematical. It is at any rate clear that he must have been a very young man at the time of the Conquest.

That "he came into England with William the Conqueror," as stated by Dugdale, does not prove that he was in the army at Hastings, and is reconcilable with the assertion in the "Recherches," that he joined him after the Conquest, corroborated by the cartulary of Whitby, before mentioned; very probably coming with him in the winter of 1067, and in company with Roger de Montgomeri, respecting whose first appearance in England the same diversity of opinion exists, and it might be his assistance in suppressing the rebellion in the West and other parts of the kingdom that gained him the favour of the King, and ultimately the Earldom of Chester, at that time enjoyed by Gherbod the Fleming, brother of Gundrada. The gift of Whitby, in Yorkshire, to Hugh, which he soon afterwards gave to William de Percy, would seem to show that he had been employed against the rebels beyond the Humber in 1068.

In 1071, Gherbod Earl of Chester being summoned to Flanders by those to whom he had intrusted the management of his hereditary domains, whatever they

were, obtained from King William leave to make a short visit to that country; but while there his evil fortune led him into a snare, and falling into the hands of his enemies, he was thrown into a dungeon, "where he endured," says Orderic, "the sufferings of a long captivity, cut off from all the blessings of life." Whether he ended his days in that dungeon Orderic does not tell us. A little more information respecting this Gherbod and his sister would be a great boon to us. At present, what we hear about them is so vague that it looks absolutely suspicious.

In consequence of this "evil fortune" which befell Gherbod, the King, continues Orderic, gave the earldom of Chester to Hugh d'Avranches, son of Richard, surnamed Goz, who, in concert with Robert de Rhuddlan and Robert de Malpas, and other fierce knights, made great slaughter amongst the Welsh.

Hugh was in fact a Count Palatine, and had the county of Chester granted to him to hold as freely by the sword as the King held the kingdom by the crown. He was all but a king himself, and had a court, and barons, and officers, such as became a sovereign prince.

We hear but little of him during the remainder of the reign of William the Conqueror, but in the rebellion against Rufus, in 1096, he stood loyally by his sove-

reign; he is charged, however, with having barbarously blinded and mutilated his brother-in-law, William Comte d'Eu, who had been made prisoner in that abortive uprising. In the same year he is also accused of committing great cruelties upon the Welsh in the Isle of Anglesea, which he ravaged in conjunction with Hugh de Montgomeri, Earl of Shrewsbury, who lost his life at that period in resisting the landing of the Norwegians under Magnus III., King of Norway. The Norse poet tells us the Earl of Shrewsbury was so completely enveloped in armour that nothing could be seen of his person but one eye. "King Magnus let fly an arrow at him, as also did a Heligoland man who stood beside the King. They both shot at once. The one shaft struck the nose-guard of the helmet, and bent it on one side, the other arrow hit the Earl in the eye and passed through his head, and this arrow was found to be the King's."

Giraldus Cambrensis gives a similar account, adding some few details, such as the derisive exclamation of Magnus, "Leit loupe!"—"Let him leap!" as the Earl sprang from the saddle when struck, and fell dead into the sea.

As this Earl of Shrewsbury was called by the Welsh "Goch," or "the Red," from the colour of his hair, so was Hugh Earl of Chester called "Vras," or

"the Fat." His popular name of Lupus, or "the Wolf," is not to be traced to his own times, and Dugdale observes that it was an addition in after ages for the sake of distinction; about the same time, I presume, that the heralds invented the coat of arms for him —"Azure, a wolf's head, erased, argent"—suggested, probably, by the name, which, if indeed of contemporary antiquity, might have been given him for his gluttony, a vice to which Orderic says he was greatly addicted. "This Hugh," he tells us, "was not merely liberal, but prodigal; not satisfied with being surrounded by his own retainers, he kept an army on foot. He set no bounds either to his generosity or his rapacity. He continually wasted even his own domains, and gave more encouragement to those who attended him in hawking and hunting than to the cultivators of the soil or the votaries of Heaven. He indulged in gluttony to such a degree that he could scarcely walk. He abandoned himself immoderately to carnal pleasures, and had a numerous progeny of illegitimate children of both sexes, but they have been almost all carried off by one misfortune or another."

With all this he displayed that curious veneration for the Church common to his age, which so ill accorded with the constant violation of its most divine precepts.

He founded the Abbey of St. Sever in Normandy, and was a great benefactor to those of Bec and Ouche (St. Evroult) in that duchy, and also to the Abbey of Whitby in Yorkshire, and in 1092 restored the ancient Abbey of St. Werburgh at Chester, and endowed it with ample possessions, substituting Benedictine monks in lieu of the secular canons who had previously occupied it; Richard, a monk of Bec, being brought over by Abbot Anselm, the Earl's confessor and afterwards the great Archbishop of Canterbury, to be the first abbot of the new community.

Being seized with a fatal illness, this pious profligate assumed the monastic habit in the Abbey of St. Werburgh, and three days after being shorn a monk died therein, 6th kalends of August (July 27), 1101.

By his Countess Ermentrude, daughter of Hugh Comte de Clermont, in Beauvoisis, and Margaret de Rouci, his wife, he had one son, Richard, seven years of age at the time of his father's death, who succeeded him in the earldom, married Matilda de Blois, daughter of Stephen, Count of Blois, by Adela, daughter of William the Conqueror, and perished with his young wife in the fatal wreck of the White Ship in 1119, leaving no issue.

GEOFFREY DE MOWBRAY, BISHOP OF COUTANCES.

Of this unquestioned companion of the Conqueror we have already heard, in conjunction with his ecclesiastical brother-in-arms, Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, by whose side he fought, if not at Senlac, at least on other occasions, and at whose trial he presided when that rapacious primate was impleaded by Lanfranc for despoiling the see of Canterbury of much of its property.

Dugdale, apparently quoting Orderic Vital, says that Geoffrey, being of a noble Norman extraction, and more skilful in arms than divinity, knowing better how to train up soldiers than to instruct his clergy, was an eminent commander in that signal battle near Hastings, in Sussex.

The words of Orderic are not quite so precise as respects the battle; he says that the Bishop rendered essential service and support at it, but neither by him nor by any other writer is it indicated that he was intrusted with a command in it. Wace describes him as receiving confessions, giving benedictions, and imposing penalties on the night before the battle, but not as taking active part in the battle itself, though, with the prelate's pugnacious propensities, it is almost im-

possible to believe he could withstand the temptation. "The Sire de Moubrai," however, mentioned as a combatant by the Norman poet, was Roger de Moubrai, brother of the Bishop, and father of Robert de Mowbray, Earl of Northumberland.

Montbrai (Moubrai) is a commune in the canton of Percy, arrondissement of St. Lô. Its name was corrupted in England into Mowbray, which, after its assumption by the family of Albini, I need scarcely observe, became one of the noblest in England.

Bishop Geoffrey appears to have preferred the name of St. Lô to that of Montbrai, and we find him therefore described as De Sancto Laudo and St. Loth.

The first time we hear of him after the battle is at the coronation of William in Westminster Abbey, when, "at the instigation of the Devil," says the pious Orderic, an unforeseen occurrence, pregnant with mischief to both nations and an omen of future calamities, suddenly occurred. For when Aldred, the Archbishop, demanded of the English, and Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, of the Normans, whether they consented to have William for their King, and the whole assembly with one voice, though not in one language, shouted assent, the men-at-arms on guard outside the Abbey, hearing the joyful acclamations of the people within in

a language they did not understand, suspected some treachery, and rashly set fire to the neighbouring houses.

The flames spreading, the congregation, seized with a panic, rushed to the doors in order to make their escape, and a scene of the utmost confusion ensued, during which the ceremony of the coronation was with difficulty completed by the trembling clergy, the mighty Conqueror himself being seriously alarmed, not so much for his life as for the evil effects of this untoward event upon his new subjects.

In 1069, when the West Saxons of Dorset and Somerset made an attack on Montacute, Bishop Geoffrey, at the head of the men of London, Winchester, and Salisbury, fell upon them by surprise and routed them, putting many to the sword and miserably mutilating the prisoners.

In 1071 he was appointed to represent the King at the trial of Bishop Odo, on the complaint of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as already mentioned; and three years later we find him again in arms beside that same Odo, marching to suppress the rebellion of the Earls of Hereford and Norfolk, and for these and other services he was rewarded by the Conqueror with "two hundred and eighty vills, which are commonly called manors."

An assistant at the coronation of the Conqueror, he was an attendant at his funeral, and died on the 2nd of February, 1093-4, leaving his large domains in England to his nephew, Robert, Earl of Northumberland, son of his brother, Roger de Moubrai, who fought at Senlac, but of whom, strange to say, there appears no trace whatever of any benefit accruing to him for his services in that important action. His son, Robert de Mowbray, Earl of Northumberland, having joined in the conspiracy against William Rufus in 1095, was taken prisoner, and languished, we are told, thirty years in a dungeon at Windsor. Orderic describes him as distinguished for his great power and wealth, his bold spirit and military daring causing him to hold his fellow nobles in contempt, and being inflated with empty pride, he disdained obedience to his superiors. In person he was of great stature, size, and strength, of a dark complexion, and covered with hair. He was bold, but at the same time crafty. His features were melancholy and harsh. He reflected more than he talked, and scarcely ever smiled when he was speaking.

It does not appear clearly by whom Robert de Mowbray was made Earl of Northumberland.

After the beheading of Waltheof,—one of the worst of the many infamous acts of William the Conqueror,

—in 1075, the government of the province appears to have been confided to Walcher, Bishop of Durham, who was murdered during a popular commotion in 1079. The earldom was then, it would seem, conferred on one Alberic, a Norman by birth, of whom a strange story is told. Being a person of great authority, and not satisfied with his own condition, he consulted the Devil, and was told that he should possess Greece. Whereupon he made a voyage into that country; but when the Greeks understood that his object was to reign over them, they despoiled him of all that he had with him, and expelled him the realm. Wearied with travel he returned to Normandy, where King Henry gave him a noble widow in marriage, and the priest at the altar asking the woman, whose name was *Gracia*, "Wilt thou have this man?" the bridegroom was suddenly made aware of the illusion of the Evil one,—

> **"Keeping the word of promise to the ear**
> **To break it to the hope."**

If there be any truth in the fact of the marriage in the reign of Henry I., apart from the legendary portion of the story, how could Robert de Mowbray be Earl of Northumberland in the time of William the Conqueror, or even of his son Rufus?

As late as 1088 (1st of Rufus), Geoffrey, Bishop of

Coutances, witnesses the charter of foundation of St. Mary's at York as Governor of the earldom: "*Eo tempore Northymbrorum Consulatum regebat,*"—an office which we have seen stated to have been held by Walcher, Bishop of Durham, after the judicial murder of Waltheof, and previous to the gift of the earldom to Alberic. The latter may have either resigned or forfeited the earldom when he left England on his Grecian expedition, and Bishop Geoffrey held the government of the county until his death in 1093, when his nephew Robert, succeeding to all his vast estates, was probably advanced to the dignity of Earl of Northumberland by Rufus. At any rate, I have not been able to arrive at any nearer approach to the fact.

The wife of this Robert was Matilda, daughter of Richer de l'Aigle, by his wife Judith, sister of Hugh, Earl of Chester. Orderic informs us that their union took place only three months before his insurrection, and that she was therefore early deprived of her husband, and long exposed to deep suffering, as during his life she could not, according to the law of God, marry again. At length by licence of Pope Paschal, before whom the case was laid by learned persons, after a long period Nigel de Albini took her to wife. Of her treatment by him we shall discourse hereafter.

I have only mentioned the fact here as affecting the date of the dissolution of the marriage, Paschal II. having succeeded to the chair of St. Peter, 15th June. 1099, and dying 21st June, 1118.

Orderic Vital says in his 7th Book, that Robert de Mowbray was detained in captivity by Rufus and his brother Henry for nearly thirty-four years, living to an advanced age, without having any children. In his 8th Book, he reduces the term to thirty years, adding that "he grew old while paying the penalty of his crimes." Admitting the shortest period, his death could not have occurred before 1125. Dugdale, who gives the earlier date of 1106, with the addition of the statement of his being shorn a monk at St. Albans, takes not the slightest notice of these contradictions. His reference is to Vincent's "Discoverie of Brooke's Errors;" but if it be an error of Brooke, who quotes no authority for his statement, Vincent has not corrected him, which he would have been too happy to do had it been in his power. The difference between eleven years and thirty, or four-and-thirty, is rather an important one; but I have been unable as yet to light upon any fact which would decide the question, which is only important in this inquiry as bearing upon another—was he old enough in 1066 to be present at Hastings with his father Roger, "the Sire

de Molbrai" of Wace, and therefore entitled to be included amongst the companions of the Conqueror? If so, he must have been close upon fifty at the time of his marriage, and, according to Orderic, an octogenarian at that of his death.

CHAPTER II.

RICHARD DE BIENFAITE.
BALDWIN DE MEULES.
RICHARD DE REDVERS.
GILBERT DE MONTFICHET.
ROGER LE BIGOD.

RICHARD DE BIENFAITE.

This great progenitor of the illustrious house of Clare, of the Barons Fitzwalter, and the Earls of Gloucester and Hertford, was the son of Gilbert, surnamed Crispin, Comte d'Eu and Brionne, grandson of Richard I., Duke of Normandy. Count Gilbert was one of the guardians of the young Duke William, and was murdered by assassins employed by Raoul de Gacé, as already related in the memoir of the Conqueror (vol. i., p. 16). Orderic gives us the name of one of the assassins—Robert de Vitot; and Guillaume de Jumiéges tells us that two of the family of Giroie fell upon and murdered him when he was peaceably riding near Eschafour, expecting no evil. This appears to have been an act of vengeance for wrongs inflicted upon the orphan children of Giroie

by Gilbert, and it is not clear what Raoul de Gacé had to do in the business.

Fearing they might meet their father's fate, Richard and his brother Baldwin were conveyed by their friends to the court of Baldwin, Count of Flanders.

On the marriage of Matilda of Flanders to Duke William in 1053, the latter, at the request of the Count, restored to the two sons of Gilbert the fiefs which in their absence he had seized and appropriated, Richard receiving those of Bienfaite and Orbec, from the first of which, latinized Benefacta, he derived one of the various names whereby he is designated and the reader of history mystified.

By Wace, who includes him among the combatants in the great battle, he is called

"Dam Richart ki tient Orbec;"

and the exchange of Brionne for Tunbridge, in the county of Kent, obtained for him the appellation of Richard of Tunbridge. At the same time the gift of the honour of Clare in Suffolk added a fourth name to the list, which is swelled by a fifth, descriptive of his parentage, viz., Richard Fitz Gilbert.

It is necessary for a reader to be acquainted with all these particulars, in order to identify the individual he meets with under so many aliases.

In the exchange of the properties above mentioned a most primitive mode of insuring their equal value was resorted to. A league was measured with a rope round the Castle of Brionne, and the same rope being brought over to England, was employed in meting out a league round Tunbridge; so that exactly the same number of miles was allotted to the latter estate as the former had been found to contain.* Besides Tunbridge, Richard possessed at the time of the compilation of Domesday one hundred and eighty-eight manors and burgages, thirty-five being in Essex and ninety-five in Suffolk.

He was associated with William de Warren as High Justiciaries of England during the King's visit to Normandy in 1067, and actively assisted in the suppression of the revolt of the Earls of Hereford and Norfolk.

Dugdale and others have confounded this Richard Fitz Gilbert or de Clare with his grandson of the same name, who was waylaid and killed by the Welsh chieftains, Joworth and his brother Morgan-ap-Owen, in a woody tract called "the ill-way of Coed Grano," near the Abbey of Lanthony, in 1135.† Richard, the son of Gilbert Crispin, would at that date have been

* Continuator of Guillaume de Jumiéges.

† Florence of Worcester, Henry of Huntingdon, Welsh Chronicle, sub anno, Giraldus Cambrensis, cap. vi.

nearly, if not quite, a hundred years old, and the Richard slain in "the Wood of Revenge," as it is still called to this day, was the second son of the Gilbert who was lord of Tunbridge at the beginning of the reign of Rufus, and joined in the rebellion of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, against that monarch in 1088. (*Vide* vol. i., page 97.)*

The pedigree of this family is one of the most confused in Dugdale's "Baronage," and has been the subject of some very severe comments by Mr. Hornby, who, while conferring great obligations upon us by his correction of the errors into which Dugdale has fallen, forgot those we are under to the learned and laborious herald for the mass of information collected and rendered accessible to us by his research and industry, and which he made doubly valuable by faithfully indicating the innumerable sources whence it was derived, enabling us to test the accuracy of his quotations and the credibility of the evidence. Fortunately, my present task is limited to the life of Richard de Bienfaite, which must have terminated either before or very early in the reign of Rufus, as

* This later Richard Fitz Gilbert is the one who was taken prisoner by Robert de Belesme at the siege of Courci in 1091, and said to have died eventually from the effects of his incarceration (Ord. Vit., lib. viii., cap. 16), which it is clear he did not.

his son Gilbert was in possession of Tunbridge in 1088.

The continued alternation of the names of Richard and Gilbert in this particular line of Clare tends greatly to confuse the genealogist, and nothing but a rigid verification of dates can preserve us from the most inexplicable entanglements. Not only has Dugdale reversed the order of events, but ascribed the same acts to both father and son, and recorded the same fate to Richard and his grandson. There is a curious indication of the probable date of the death of Richard de Bienfaite in the long, rambling, and ridiculous story of an adventure which occurred to a priest named Walkelin, afterwards known as St. Aubin, Bishop of Angers, and who in 1091 resided at Bonneval, in the diocese of Lisieux. At the commencement of the month of January in that year, having been summoned in the middle of the night to visit a sick man who lived at the further extremity of the parish, he was alarmed on his road homewards by what sounded like the tramp of a considerable body of soldiers, and thought it was part of the forces of Robert de Belesme on their march to lay siege to the Castle of Courci. Considering it prudent to avoid them, he made for a group of medlar trees at some distance from the road, with the intention of concealing himself

behind them till the troops had passed; but he was suddenly confronted by a man of enormous stature, wielding a massive club, who shouted to him, "Stand! Take not a step further!" The priest, frozen with terror, remained motionless, leaning on his staff. The gigantic club-bearer stood close beside him, and without offering to do him any injury, awaited silently the passage of the troops. The moon, we are assured, shed a resplendent light, and speedily there appeared an apparently interminable procession of deceased persons of both sexes and all classes, amongst whom the priest recognised many of his neighbours who had lately died, and heard them bewailing the excruciating torments they were suffering for the evil they had done in their time. There were also ladies of high rank, and, *mirabile dictu*, bishops, abbots, and monks, many of whom were considered saints on earth, all groaning and wailing, and these were followed by a mighty host of warriors, fully armed, on great war-horses, and carrying black banners. There were seen, says the narrator, Richard and Baldwin, sons of Count Gilbert, *who were lately dead*, and amongst the rest Landri of Orbec, who was killed the same year; William de Glos, son of Barno, the steward of William de Breteuil and of his father, William, Earl of Hereford; and Robert, son of Ralph le Blond, the priest's

own brother, with whom he had a long conversation on family matters.

I will spare the reader the more preposterous details of this absurd story and the sermons with which it is interlarded, merely observing that Orderic, who relates it, assures us that he heard it from the priest's own mouth, and saw the mark on his face which was left by the fiery hand of one of the terrible knights. We have, therefore, incidental evidence of one fact recorded in it, the death of Richard de Bienfaite and his brother Baldwin, *before* January, 1091, or, according to our present calculation, 1090, for Orderic sometimes begins his year at Christmas, and at others at Easter.

The wife of Richard de Bienfaite, Lord of Tunbridge and Clare, was Rohesia, the only daughter of Walter Giffard, the first Earl of Buckingham, and by her he had six sons, Godfrey, Robert (from whom the Barons Fitz Walter), Richard, a monk at Bec, Walter and Roger, who both died without issue, and Gilbert, who succeeded him, and became the direct progenitor of the great Earl of Hertford and Gloucester. He had also two daughters, Rohesia, wife of Eudo Dapifer, and another unnamed, who married Ralph de Telgers.

The fact that the first Fitz Walter was the great-grandson of Richard de Bienfaite is sufficient to prove

that his (Fitz Walter's) name was subsequently introduced into the Roll of Battle Abbey.

BALDWIN DE MEULES.

This younger brother of Richard de Bienfaite is not distinctly mentioned in the "Roman de Rou" in the list of the Norman knights at Hastings; but M. le Prévost considers him to have been the personage spoken of as

"Cil ki fu Sire de Reviers."

Notwithstanding that, he contends the first who assumed the name of Reviers was Richard, the son of this Baldwin, who in 1082 witnessed a charter to the Abbaye aux Dames, in which I believe him to be mistaken.

Wace so constantly leaves us to discover who was the "sire" of the fief he mentions at the date of the Conquest, and confounds the son with the father, that M. le Prévost may be excused for his belief could he prove that Richard Fitz Baldwin was ever called "De Reviers," a vill near Creulli, arrondissement of Caen, from which the family of Rivers derived their name.

Richard, indeed, could not have been in the battle, as he was living seventy years afterwards, and could scarcely have been born in 1066.

No special deeds are, however, recorded of the Sire de Reviers in that memorable conflict. He is only said to have brought with him many knights, who were foremost in the fight, and trampled down the English with their powerful war-horses.

Whatever were the services of Baldwin, he was rewarded by the gift of one hundred and sixty-four manors in the west of England, one hundred and fifty-nine being in the county of Devon, besides nineteen houses in Exeter, and a site within the walls to build a castle on for his own residence, the government of the city and the shrievalty of the county being confided to him. He is therefore called Baldwin the Viscount, or the Sheriff, and Baldwin of Exeter, in addition to his Norman appellations, Baldwin de Sap, Baldwin de Meules, or, as it is latinised, de Molis (the two estates which were restored to him by Duke William at the same time that his brother Richard received Bienfaite and Orbec), and his patronymic Baldwin Fitz Gilbert de Brionne, or sometimes simply Baldwin de Brionne.

Under each of these names he will be met with in different chronicles and histories, to the bewilderment of the readers unversed in Norman genealogy.

By his wife Albreda,* who is said to have been a

* Dugdale oddly enough describes her as "niece to King William, viz., daughter of his aunt." Whichever she might be, she could not be both.

daughter of an aunt of the Conqueror, and by some his niece, he had issue three sons, Richard, Robert, and William, the second of whom in 1090 was intrusted with the custody of the Castle of Brionne, and on being commanded by the Duke of Normandy to deliver it up to Roger de Beaumont, to whom for a great sum of money Court-heuse had promised it, in his answer obliged us with the following pedigree:—

"If," he is reported to have said, "you will retain it in your own hands, as your father did, I will immediately render it to you, otherwise I will keep it as my own inheritance as long as I live. For it is very well known to all the inhabitants of this country that old Richard, Duke of Normandy, gave it with the whole country to Godfrey, his son, and that he at his death left it to Gilbert, his son, who, being barbarously murdered by wicked men, his sons for refuge fled to Baldwin, Count of Flanders; whereupon your father (William the Conqueror), taking it wholly into his own hands, disposed thereof to several persons as he thought good; but after a while, having wedded the daughter of the said Count of Flanders, at the request of that Count, he rendered to Baldwin, my father, Mola and Sappo (Meules and Sap), and gave him his aunt's daughter to wife; and to Richard, my father's brother,

he restored Benefact (Bienfaite) and Orbec, and lastly by your special favour I do now enjoy this Brionne, the principal town of Gilbert, my grandfather."

If any dependence is to be placed on this passage in Orderic, it is clear that Robert de Meules must have known that his father's wife was the cousin of the Conqueror, and that his father was then dead, which corroborates the statement of the priest Walkelin, that Richard and Baldwin, sons of Count Gilbert, were recently deceased in 1090 or 1091. Baldwin is said to have had also three daughters, one of whom, named Adeliza, wife of Ralph Avenel, alone survived him, and a natural son named Guiger, who was shorn a monk in the Abbey of Bec. But who was his wife Albreda, said to have been a niece of Richard II., Duke of Normandy? and who was Emma, another wife of Baldwin, twice mentioned by William, both as Duke of Normandy in 1066, and as King of England in 1082, in his charter to the Holy Trinity at Caen, and by which of them was his issue? For, be it remarked, that Robert, in his address to Court-heuse, though he speaks of his father having married a cousin of the Conqueror, does not call her his mother, nor by naming her enable us to identify her either as Albreda or Emma.

In Domesday, "the wife of Baldwin the Sheriff" is

returned as the holder of Wimple, in Devon, but unfortunately no Christian name is recorded. Père Anselm gives Baldwin two wives—1, Albreda, and 2, Emma; and suggests that the former was the child of an illegitimate daughter of Richard II., Duke of Normandy, wife of Mauger, Vicomte of the Cotentin, and quotes a charter of hers by which, with the consent of *her sons Richard and Robert*, she gives to the Abbey of Bec the land of Bradeforde and the Church of St. Michael d'Ermentonne.* As the first wife of Baldwin this evidence is conclusive as regards Richard and Robert at any rate being the issue of Albreda. By his second wife Emma, with whose consent he gave the Churches of La Forest and two hundred acres of land in the same place to the Abbey of the Holy Trinity at Caen, he may have had the two youngest daughters, as one appears to have been named Emma, and married Hugues de Wast.

And now to return to the question of who was "le Sire de Reviers" at Senlac, if Baldwin were not he. That he had a son Richard is indisputable; but that son, known only as Richard Fitz Baldwin and Richard the Viscount, having succeeded his father in the shrievalty of Devonshire and the barony of Oke-

* In M. de Magny's list we have Badouin and *Roger* de Meules. Who was Roger?

hampton, died in 1137 without issue, and being first buried at Brightly, was subsequently removed by his sister Adeliza, his sole heiress, to Ford Abbey; and there is no authority for his having ever been called De Redvers or De Reviers.

Dugdale, in his "Baronage" (vol. i., p. 785), has, however, confounded him with one who was well known by that title—

RICHARD DE REDVERS,

who died in 1107 (thirty years before Richard Fitz Baldwin), and was buried at Monteburgh, an abbey in Normandy, of which he appears to have been one of the earliest benefactors, if not the founder, by permission of William the Conqueror, in 1080. The top of his stone coffin was preserved from destruction by M. de Gerville, and the epithet "Fundator" was said to have been then visible upon it.

But I am burying the man before I have brought him into existence! Let us try, therefore, to discover his parentage, as it is quite clear he was not the son of Baldwin de Meules and Albreda, as till recently he has been recorded.

The late Mr. Stapleton, in his Addenda to the second volume of his "Illustrations of the Norman Rolls of the

Exchequer," appears to assert (for I confess I cannot clearly understand the passage) that he was the son of a William de Redvers; but unfortunately does not print the charter on which he seems to found his opinion. In the grant of Lodres, in Dorsetshire, to the Abbey of Monteburgh, Richard de Redvers certainly gives "also the land which William de Redvers had in Monteburgh" (Gallia Christiana, vol. xi.), but he does not call him his father, or allude in any way to his relationship. In another charter printed by Mr. Stapleton, he speaks of his father and mother, but without naming them.

In the cartulary of Carisbrook he is called the nephew of William Fitz Osbern, and the grant of the Isle of Wight to him after the death of Roger de Breteuil, Earl of Hereford, certainly gives some support to the assertion. William Fitz Osbern had at least one other daughter besides the unfortunate Countess of Norfolk, of whom we learn no more than that she became the mother of Raynold de Cracci. Her daughter may have been the wife of Richard de Redvers, which would justify the expression "nepos," used indifferently for nephew or grandson.

The continuator of Guillaume de Jumiéges tells us that one of Gunnora's nieces married Osmund de

Centumville (*i. e.* Cotenville), Vicomte de *Vernon*, and had by him Fulk de Aneio (a companion of the Conqueror of whom I shall have to speak) and several daughters, one of whom was the mother of the first Baldwin de Redvers:. "qua una mater fuit primi Baldwini de Revers" (cap. xxxvii.). Some have considered this to apply to Baldwin de Brionne or de Meules, and others to the first Baldwin de Redvers, Earl of Devon, but the foundation charter to Monteburgh appears to me to solve this riddle. Richard de Redvers (the founder) signs before Earl Simon and Earl Eustace, and following their signatures were those of "Baldwin, son of Richard de Redvers," and of Willermi (William) brother of the same Baldwin. Here we have a Baldwin de Redvers and a William his brother, giving credibility to the assertion that their grandfather might have been a William de Redvers, according to Mr. Stapleton.* At the same time it is probable that he was the first Baldwin de Redvers, and father of the Richard who was "the Sire de Reviers" at Hastings, and died in 1107, having been one of the principal counsellors and champions of Prince Henry in his conflicts with his brother, Robert Court-heuse, and who shortly after his accession to the throne in 1100, rewarded his friend's service by the

* In both the French lists we find a William as well as a Richard.

gift of Tiverton and Plympton, and the third penny of the pleas of the county of Devon.

Mr. Stapleton in his "Addenda," above mentioned, denies that this Richard de Redvers was ever Earl of Devon; but if it be true that he had the third penny of the pleas, the gift of tertium denarium would carry with it the earldom, though the ceremony of girding with the sword (generally supposed not to have been practised before the reign of John) might not have been performed.

The argument that we do not find him styled Earl in contemporary documents is of no great value, as such omission is common in ancient charters; but that his wife Adeliza thought him an earl is clear from her charter to Twinham, in which she gives to the Church of the Holy Trinity her Church of Thorlei for the health of the souls of her Lord Richard, *Earl* of Redvers, and of her son, *Earl* Baldwin; the grant being made with the consent of "*Earl* Richard, my grandson and heir." Here you will observe that she styles her husband, her son, and her grandson all earls, but not of Devon, though the two latter were so beyond question. Therefore the omission cannot be used as an argument against the first.

This Lady Adeliza was a daughter of William Peverel of Nottingham and his wife Adelina of Lan-

caster, and her family by Richard de Redvers consisted of three sons, Baldwin, Earl of Devon, William, surnamed De Vernon, and Robert of St. Mary Church, and one daughter, Hawisia, wife of William de Roumare, Earl of Lincoln. Baldwin and William must both have been very young at the time they witnessed the charter to Monteburgh, as the former did not die till 1155. His mother survived him, but how long is not certain. She was dead before 1165, and must, if these dates can be relied on, have been nearly a centenarian. But for the precise information contained in her charter to Twinham, I should be inclined to believe with Dr. Oliver that a generation had been omitted in the pedigree.

GILBERT DE MONTFICHET.

This Norman lord of a commune situated on the road from St. Lô to Bayeux, and where as late as 1827 might be seen a few ruins of the castle which was the original stronghold of the family, is, according to Monsieur le Prévost, "one of the most authentic personages who can be named as having assisted at the battle of Hastings." (Note to "Le Roman de Rou," vol. ii., p. 256.) But we hear of him then for the first time, and simply as "le Sire de Monfichet," without any exploit having been recorded of him.

What is our astonishment, then, on consulting Dugdale, to learn, on the authority of an ancient history of the family,* that the said Gilbert de Montfichet (Montfiquet) was a Roman by birth, descended from an old illustrious Roman family (De Montefixio ?) ; that he was in the habit of dispensing palatial hospitality to all royal visitors to the Papal Court, and specially entertaining William, Duke of Normandy, whenever he set foot in the sacred city; and that he was a kinsman of the Duke, and privy to all his councils, especially to that design of King Edward the Confessor to make him his successor to the realm of England.

How is it that in no contemporary historian can we find a trace of the Count, Marquis, or Duke of the Normans, as William is indifferently styled, having ever crossed the Alps, or extended his travels further than France, England, and Flanders? As a boy he was at Paris; as a man, at Poissy. In 1051 he was in England, and it is believed in 1066 in Flanders; but at what other time had he a day, I might almost say an hour, the occupation of which is not accounted for, rendering a journey to Rome in the interim an actual impossibility? What can have been the origin of this extraordinary story? How could Dugdale have copied this account without a comment? Is the whole

* Mon. Ang., vol. ii. p. 236.

romance the concoction of David the Priest, a Scot by birth, whom Gilbert so loved that he gave to him a place called Tremhale, in the county of Essex, whereon to build a church and other monastic edifices, viz., the Priory of Tremhale, of which this ancient MS. would seem to have been one of the muniments; and if so, how much are we to believe of it?

Utterly incredulous of the statement that he (Gilbert) entertained that Duke in his house *whenever* he came to Rome—which implies more than one visit to the Eternal City—what faith are we to attach to the description of Gilbert's Italian extraction, and of his kinsmanship to the Conqueror? Was he named after his property in the Roman States, and did he impart it to or derive it from this land in Normandy acquired by gift or marriage? Nothing has yet been discovered to elucidate the subject. We are ignorant of whom he married or when he died; the aforesaid history merely informing us that, after the gift of Tremhale to the priest David, he returned to Rome, leaving what he had obtained in England by his services to the Conqueror at the battle of Hastings and afterwards, to his son Richard, who, on arriving at man's estate, travelled to Rome, and being a person of extraordinary strength obtained much fame in casting a stone, no man being able to do the like, in

memory whereof certain pillars of brass were set up to mark the distance.

What is nearly as singular as this story is the fact that the large possessions Gilbert is reported to have obtained in reward for his services are not to be found in Domesday, and that it is not till we come to a William Montfichet, apparently a grandson or great nephew of Gilbert the Roman, and the husband of Margaret de Clare, daughter of Gilbert Fitz Richard of Tunbridge, that we find mention of any possessions in England whatever.

Monsieur le Prévost asserts so positively that there can be no question but that Gilbert was the Sire de Montfichet mentioned by Wace amongst the combatants at Senlac, that he must doubtlessly have found authority sufficient to justify his doing so. I should otherwise be inclined to consider the companion of the Conqueror was a William de Montfichet, father or uncle of the William above named, who had a wife named Rohais, and was certainly a contemporary of the Conqueror, as in his reign he granted to the monks of Croisy in Normandy the Church of St. Marculf, with the tithes thereto belonging, and one plough land; also the Church of Fontenis and its tithes, with certain lands in Sotaville; likewise two salt works, with two boats for great fish; *the right use of every*

great fish, with one piece of the small, and two islands lying in the sea. Surely at the time of this grant he must have been the Lord of Montfichet, but whether a brother or a son of Gilbert we are at present without means of even surmising.

Dugdale has, I think, confounded him with his son or nephew, the second William, who was certainly the founder of the fortunes of the family in England, most probably by his marriage with a daughter of the great house of Clare, with whose consent, and that of his son and heir, Gilbert, he founded in 1135 (35th Henry I.) the Abbey of Stratford Langton, in Essex, within the precincts of his lordship of Westham. It was, I presume, in commemoration of this alliance that his descendants assumed the arms of Clare, unless, as some have suggested, they were themselves a branch of that great family, a conjecture the names of Gilbert and Richard certainly tend to support, as well as the tradition of their being kinsmen of the Conqueror, but which would be fatal to the story of the descent from an illustrious race of Romans.

The male line of William and Margaret de Clare terminated in their great-grandson Richard, Sheriff of the county of Essex, Governor of the Castle of Hertford, and Justice of the King's Forests in no less than

fifteen English counties. His name descends to us with the town of Stansted-Montfichet, the seat of his barony in the reign of Henry III. Adelina, the second of his three sisters and coheirs, married William de Fortibus (second of that name), Earl of Albemarle, whose granddaughter Adelina, having first married Ingleram de Percy, became the wife of Edmund, surnamed Crouchback, Earl of Lancaster, second son of King Henry III., but died without adding to the royal family of England.

ROGER LE BIGOD.

The owner of this great historical name, who accompanied the Conqueror to England, was apparently the son of Robert le Bigod, the first of the name of whom we have any notice, and who was a witness to the foundation of St. Philibert-sur-Risle, in 1066. Wace, in his enumeration of the leaders in the host at Hastings, designates the member of this family simply as the ancestor of Hugh le Bigot, Lord of Maletot, Loges, and Canon.

> "L'Ancestre Hue le Bigot
> Ki avoit terre a Maletot,
> Etais Loges et a Chanon."
>
> *Roman de Rou*, l. 1377.

Maletot is near Caen, Canon (Chanon) is in the arron-

dissement of Lisieux, and Loges may have been either Les Loges, near Aunay, or another commune of the same name in the neighbourhood of Falaise.*

The possession of these lands in Normandy by "the ancestor of Hugh le Bigot" is a curious fact, taken into consideration with the account the monk of Jumiéges gives of this ancestor. Robert le Bigod, he tells us, was a knight in the service of William Werlenc, or the Warling, Comte de Mortain, and so poor that he prayed his lord to permit him to go and seek his fortune in Apulia, where his countrymen were establishing themselves and acquiring wealth and dignity under the leadership of Robert Guiscard. The Count bade him remain, assuring him that within eighty days he (Robert) would be in a position to help himself to whatever he desired in Normandy.

Whether the Count contemplated the deposition of Duke William, or was privy to the design of others, may never be known, but Robert le Bigod, inferring from this advice that some rebellious movement was projected, repaired to Richard Goz, Vicomte of the Hiemois, who was at that moment highly in favour with the Duke, and requested him to obtain an audience for him. Richard, who, according to the same authority, was a kinsman of Robert—it would be interesting to

* Le Prévost: Notes to Le Rom. de Rou, vol. ii., p. 256.

learn how—readily complied, and Le Bigod having repeated to the Duke the words of the Warling, the latter was instantly summoned to attend him, accused of treason, banished the country, and the Comté of Mortain was bestowed upon the Duke's half-brother Robert, the son of Herleve by Herluin. That William jumped at this opportunity to rid himself of a possible competitor whose claim to the duchy was clearly stronger than his own, and at the same time to advance one of his own family who would have no such pretensions, there can be no doubt. The truth or falsehood of the story told to him by Robert le Bigod has never been established. The defence of the accused, if he made any, has not been recorded; and even Mr. Freeman admits that the Duke's "justice, if justice it was, fell so sharply and speedily as to look very like interested oppression." * We have seen in the previous notice of Raoul de Gael what opinion was held in his own days of this suspicious act of the Conqueror. From that moment Robert le Bigod became a confidential servant of his sovereign, and his son Roger was the companion of the Conqueror, who for his services at Senlac received large grants of land in the counties of Essex and Suffolk, six lordships in the former and one hundred and seventeen in the latter.

* Norm. Conq., vol. ii., p. 290.

Mons. le Prévost remarks that Wace, always inclined to treat the present as the past, has attributed to Roger the office of seneschal, which was only enjoyed by his second son William. With all deference, I think the learned antiquary has misunderstood his author. Wace is not speaking of Roger le Bigod, the father of Hugh and William, but of "the ancestor of Hugh," Robert, as I take it, "who served the Duke in his house as one of his seneschals, which office he held in fee."

Mr. Taylor remarks that there is no authority for this statement, yet we find that Roger, who was one of the privy councillors and treasurer of the Duke, was seneschal or steward to Henry I., after the decease of his father, and that both William and Hugh, his sons, succeeded each other in that high office, which is a fair corroboration of the assertion that it was held in fee. If Wace be in error it is in his intimation, as I understand him, that it was Hugh's grandfather Robert, and not his father, Roger, who accompanied Duke William to Hastings.

As we have no means at present of ascertaining the age of Robert when he accused his lord of treason, it is not improbable that he, as well as his son Roger, was at Senlac. The latter survived the Conquest forty-three years, and may have been a young man in

1066, and his father not too old to bestride a war steed and lead his retainers into action. Whether father or son, we are told that "he had a large troop, and was a noble vassal. He was small of body, but very brave and daring, and assaulted the English with his mace gallantly." (*Roman de Rou*, l. 13,682-87.) We hear nothing of him during the reign of the first William, but at the commencement of that of the second, Roger le Bigod is found amongst the adherents of Robert Court-heuse, fortifying his castle at Norwich and laying waste the country round about: whether eventually reconciled to Rufus, or what was the result of the suppressed rebellion to him personally, we are without information; but in the first year of the reign of Henry I., being one of those who stood firm to the King, he had Framlingham, in Suffolk, of his gift.

In 1103, by the advice of King Henry, Maud the Queen, Hubert Bishop of Norwich, and his own wife, the Lady Adeliza, one of the daughters and co-heirs of Hugh de Grentmesnil, seneschal of England, he founded the Abbey of Thetford, in the county of Norfolk, and, dying in 1107, was buried there.

By the Lady Adeliza he is said to have had seven children—William, his son and heir, who by his charter, confirming his father's gift to Thetford, informs us that he was "Dapifer regis Anglorum;" 2. Hugh

le Bigod, the first earl; 3. Richard; 4. Geoffrey; 5. John; 6. Maud, wife of William de Albini Pincerna; and 7. Gunnora, who married, first, Robert of Essex, and, secondly, Hamo de Clare. William perished in the fatal wreck of the White Ship, and Hugh, his brother and heir, in his turn steward of the King's household, was eventually created Earl of Norfolk; his descendants, by a match with Maud, the eldest daughter and co-heiress of the Marshals, Earls of Pembroke, becoming marshals of England, an office enjoyed to this day by the Dukes of Norfolk.

The name and origin of this family, Mr. Taylor remarks, seem more worthy of consideration than has hitherto been given to it.* The name is spelt indifferently Bigod, Bigot, Bihot, Vigot, Wigot, Wihot, and Wigelot, generally with the prefix of "le." The Normans are represented by the French to be "*Bigoz* and Drauchiers;" the latter term is understood to mean consumers of barley—perhaps beer-drinkers—and the former presumed to have been given them from their constantly taking the name of the Almighty in vain. Anderson, in his "Genealogical Tables," says, without quoting his authority, that Rollo was styled "Bygot," from his frequent use of the phrase. This derivation receives some support from the well

* Notes to Rom. de Rou, p. 235.

known story of the altercation between Edward I. and Roger le Bigod, Earl of Norfolk, nephew of the former Roger, which is recorded unfortunately in Latin by Walter of Hemingford, and is therefore deprived of its otherwise singularly illustrative application, which, if the words were spoken in English, would be of some weight in the argument.

In answer to the King's declaration, "*By God*, Earl, you shall either go or hang!" the undaunted baron replied, "By the same oath, O King, I will neither go nor hang!" The "per Deum" and the "per idem juramentum" of the chronicler leaves us in uncertainty whether or not a play on the words was intended by either speaker.

I have a theory of my own, which I by no means insist upon, but only offer for the consideration of those most competent to investigate the subject. The prefix "le" distinctly points out that the name is not derived from a possession or a place of birth. It is either a personal or a general designation. Personal it cannot be in this case, as it is applied to the whole nation, and we are therefore driven to the conclusion that it either alluded to a national habit or a national origin.

The former is the received opinion, as stated above; but it has to be shown that the purely Teutonic words, "Bei Gott" were used in common parlance by the

Normans. We find their war-cry was "*Dex* aie," and "par Die;" "par Dieu" is to this day so constantly in the mouth of a Frenchman that he could scarcely disparage a foreigner for an equally common breach of the third commandment in any language.

I am inclined to believe the Normans were considered by the French as a race of Goths (as indeed they were)—a barbarous people, such as even now we should describe as "Goths and Vandals;" and the south of France having been subdued and occupied by them for nearly five centuries by that branch of the great Sythic family, distinguished as the West Goths or Visigoths, the latter appellation being more familiar to the French may have been corrupted into Vigot and Bigot, from which source I would also derive the well-known Norman name of Wigod.

The example I have already given of similar corruptions in the name of Raoul de Gael (p. 10, *ante*) will, I think, justify me in suggesting, on these grounds, that the family of Le Bigod was of Visigothic origin, and, as in the case of Baldric the German, or Robert the Frison, had assumed or been designated by the name of their race and country, of which they were proud, notwithstanding the sense wherein it was applied by the French to the Normans generally. We have "le Angevin," "le Fleming," "le Breton," "le

Poitevin," "le Scot," &c., and in this category I think we may class "le Vigot," an abbreviation of "le Visigot," spelt, as we find it, indifferently with a "B" or a "W" (Bigot and Wigot), according to the particular dialect of the writers. The application of the name to the Normans generally, while it proves that it was not derived from any hereditary possession or personal peculiarity, as in other cases, also testifies to the purity of the family, which was distinguished amongst its own people by the designation of that great Gothic stock whence they commonly proceeded.

A signet ring was dug up some few years ago on one of the estates in Norfolk which had belonged to this family, exhibiting the figure of a goat, with the word "By" above it, being a punning device or rebus "By *Goat.*" It is engraved in Mr. Taylor's translation of the "Roman de Rou" (p. 235, note), but of the legend round it the word "God" is alone distinguishable. This, however, is merely a mediæval curiosity of no importance to the question of derivation. To settle that question we must "learn to labour and to wait."

CHAPTER III.

HUMPHREY DE BOHUN.
HENRY DE FERRERS.
GEOFFREY DE MANDEVILLE.
HUGH DE GRENTMESNIL.
RICHARD DE COURCI.

HUMPHREY DE BOHUN.

"De Bohun le Vieil Onfrei."

Roman de Rou, l. 13,583.

WACE appears to be specially addicted to represent the companions of the Conqueror as venerable from age as renowned for their valour. Humphrey "with the beard," however, who is the De Bohun he is here commemorating, may, with some propriety, be styled "the old," as there is evidence that previous to the Conquest he had been thrice married; his grant to the nuns of St. Amand at Rouen of a tithe of his own plough and a garden, being made for the health of his soul and the souls of his three wives, not one of whom unfortunately is named, but it is witnessed by "William *Comes*," as the Duke of Normandy was often termed prior to his elevation to the throne of

England, the titles of Count and Duke being indifferently used by him and by his predecessors.

The practice of close shaving amongst the Normans, and which caused the spies of Harold to report that the invading army was an army of priests, is further illustrated by such distinctions as "with the beard," and "with the whiskers," being employed to identify particular members of a family. Several examples of this practice have already been noticed.

Of the origin of the De Bohuns very little has yet been discovered. We are vaguely informed that the first of this name known to us, the aforesaid Humphrey with the beard, was a near kinsman of the Conqueror, but in what particular degree, or by which of the many branches, legitimate and illegitimate, of the ducal house of Normandy, no information is afforded us. After the Conquest he became possessed of the lordship of Talesford, in the county of Norfolk, so that whatever his relationship to or support of William may have been, no very great benefit appears to have resulted from it.

Bohun, or rather Bohon, the place whence the family derived its name, is situated in the arrondissement of St. Lô, in the Cotentin, where are still the communes of St. André and St. George de Bohon. The mound of the castle was visible some thirty years

ago, and may be still. The honour of Bohon was in possession of this Humphrey at the time of the Norman invasion, and his later gift of the Church of St. George de Bohon as a cell to the Abbey of Marmoutier, is confirmed by William, King of the English, "his Queen Mathildis, his sons Robert and William, his half-brother Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, Michael, Bishop of Avranches, Roger de Montgomeri, and Richard, son of Turstain," husband of Emma de Conteville, which certainly supports the belief that he was closely connected with the Conqueror, probably by one of his wives, respecting whose parentage we are left so provokingly in the dark.

He died before 1113, having had issue three sons and two daughters, but by which wife or wives we are unhappily in ignorance. How important, genealogically, to the descent it is scarcely necessary to observe.

One of the daughters appears to me to have been named Adela; at least I find an Adela, aunt of Humphrey de Bohun, in the Fine Roll for Wiltshire, 31st of Henry I., and it could not have been on the mother's side, or she would have been a daughter of Edward of Salisbury, that mysterious personage, one of whose daughters, named Maud or Mabel, was wife of Humphrey II., the youngest of the three sons of "old Humphrey," and the founder of the fortunes of the family.

The eldest son, Robert, died, in his father's lifetime apparently, unmarried; and from Richard, the second son, descended in the female line the Bohuns of Midhurst, in Sussex; but the grandeur of the Bohuns was due to the extraordinary succession of great matches made by the descendants of the youngest sons, who became Earls of Hereford, Essex, and Northampton, the co-heiresses of the eleventh and last Humphrey de Bohun being the wives, one of Thomas of Woodstock, Earl of Gloucester, and son of King Edward III., and the other of Henry, surnamed Bolingbroke, son of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and subsequently ascending the throne of England as King Henry IV.

HENRY DE FERRERS.

"Henri le Sire de Ferriers," commemorated by Wace as a combatant at Senlac, was Seigneur de Saint Hilaire de Ferriers, near Bernay, and son of Walkelin de Ferrers, who fell in a contest with the first Hugh de Montfort we hear of in the early days of Duke William II., and therefore, though a younger son, for he had an elder brother named Guillaume, who, Monsieur de Pluquet tells us, was also in the great battle, must have been well advanced in years in 1066.

Whatever his services, it was not till after Hugh d'Avranches was created Earl of Chester, in 1071, that Henry de Ferrers received at least the Castle of Tutbury, his "caput Baronie," which had been previously granted to the said Hugh, and resigned by him on becoming Earl of Chester. In 1085, we find him appointed one of the commissioners for the general survey of the kingdom, and in that year he is recorded as the holder, besides the Castle of Tutbury, of seven lordships in Staffordshire, twenty in Berkshire, three in Wiltshire, five in Essex, seven in Oxfordshire, two in Lincolnshire, two in Buckinghamshire, one in Gloucestershire, two in Herefordshire, three in Hampshire, thirty-five in Leicestershire, six in Warwickshire, three in Nottinghamshire, and one hundred and fourteen in Derbyshire! When bestowed, however, or how obtained, whether wholly by grant of the King, or partly by marriage, is not recorded. Neither have we succeeded in identifying his wife, Berta, in conjunction with whom he founded and richly endowed the Priory of Tutbury in 1089, "by the concession and authority of William *the younger* (Rufus), King of the English." The date of his death also is unknown; but he had issue three sons, Enguenulf, William, and Robert. The two eldest died in his lifetime without issue, and

Robert, who succeeded him, was the first Earl of Ferrers, not Earl Ferrers, as incorrectly described by some, but "Robertus, Comes de Ferrarius" or "de Ferriers," as in the charter of the second Earl Robert, who was also Earl of Nottingham, and according to Orderic Vital, the first Earl of Derby.

It is no part of the plan of this work to enter into details respecting the descendants of the actual companions of the Conqueror, but there are exceptions to most, if not to all, rules, and there is so little to be said about Henry de Ferrers, and so much about his immediate successors, that I am tempted to depart from my own rule on this occasion.

There is considerable difference of opinion, in the absence of indubitable facts, as to which of these two Roberts—father and son—distinguished himself in the famous battle at Northallerton, known as the Battle of the Standard, also as to the exact period at which the earldoms of Nottingham and Derby were conferred upon an Earl of Ferrers; but the principal bone of contention is the identification of the fortunate member of that family who married Margaret, daughter and heiress of William Peverel, Lord of Nottingham, who was dispossessed of his estates by King Henry II., for conspiring with Maud, Countess of Chester, to poison her husband, Ranulph Gernons, Earl of Chester, in 1155.

Now this is a very curious story, which has been received in perfect confidence, and handed down from writer to writer, as a portion of the history of England, until, at the Newark Congress of the British Archæological Association, I ventured to question the very existence even of the Margaret Peverel, who has been married by various genealogists to at least three successive Earls of Ferrers.

In the charter of King Stephen to the monks of Lanton we find mention of this William Peverel, of his wife Oddona, and his son Henry, at that time most probably his heir apparent; but there is no notice of any daughter, and the rolls of the reign of Henry I., Stephen, and Henry II., in which mention is made of many Peverels, including the mother and sister of William Peverel of Nottingham, are equally silent on the score of a daughter, and acknowledge no Margaret Peverel of any branch.

Vincent gives Margaret to the first Earl William, who tells us himself that his wife's name was Sibilla; others to William's father, the second Robert, who explicitly declares that his wife was another Sibilla, daughter of William, Lord Braose of Bramber; and my dear lamented friend, the late Rev. C. Hartshorne, in the "Archæological Journal" (vol. v., p. 129), calls

Margaret the wife of the first Robert, who married Hawise de Vitry.

For the proof that William was the happy man we are referred to the Oblate Roll of the 1st of John, in which it is said that William, the third earl of that name, calls Margaret his grandmother. Now here is the entry referred to, in which you will find no such thing:—"The Earl of Ferrers gives two thousand marks for Hecham, Blidsworth, and Newbottle, that the King may forego all claim to other lands which were William Peverel's, and the King gives to him the park of Hecham, which the Lord Henry, his great-grandfather (that is, King Henry II.) gave in exchange to the ancestors of William Peverel," Where is Margaret? Where any mention of the grandmother of the Earl of Ferrers?

The next reference is to a plea-roll of the 25th of Henry III., which certainly proves that some Earl of Ferrers assumed a right of heirship to William Peverel, but by no means hints that it was in right of his wife, or makes any mention of Margaret. The words are remarkable. The Earl of Ferrers is therein stated to have *made himself heir* of the aforesaid William Peverel, and to have *intruded himself* into the same inheritance during the war between the King and his barons. Now, we are told that one of

the earliest acts of Henry II. in the year after his accession, viz., 1155, was to disinherit William Peverel, the staunch supporter of his old rival Stephen, upon the opportune charge of poisoning the Earl of Chester, as before mentioned. Henry himself does not charge him specifically with it, but the cause is distinctly stated by the Chronicon Roffense, the register of Dunstable, Matthew Paris, Matthew of Westminster, and Gervase of Dover, a goodly array of highly respectable authorities.

But how are we to reconcile this statement with the fact that Henry, before he ascended the throne, most probably at the time of the pacification with Stephen in 1152, and certainly not later than 1153, in which year Earl Ranulph died, gave to this very Ranulph the man Peverel is accused of poisoning, with other large estates of hostile nobles, the castle and town of Nottingham, and the whole fee of William Peverel, wherever it was (with the exception of Hecham) unless he (William Peverel) could acquit and clear himself of his wickedness and treason? Are we not justified in believing, upon the evidence of this agreement—for such is the nature of the instrument, which is witnessed by parties both for Henry and Ranulph,—that Peverel was dispossessed of his estates, not for assisting to poison the Earl of Chester, for to that very

Earl the estates are given, but for wickedness and treason generally—in plain words, for supporting Stephen manfully and faithfully against Henry and his mother ?

Such was evidently the opinion of Sir Peter Leycester, who printed this important document at length in his "Prolegomena," prefaced with these words, "How Randal Earl of Chester was rewarded for taking part with Henry Fitz-Empress, being yet but Duke of Normandy and Earl of Anjou, may appear by this deed following." No hint of its being a compensation to him for injury inflicted by Peverel.

And what was the punishment of the Countess Maud, the supposed accomplice of Peverel, and if so, the most culpable of the twain ? She survived the Earl her husband many years, and her name is associated with that of her son, Hugh Kevilioc, in several acts of benevolence and piety, amongst them actually the purchase of absolution for her husband, who died excommunicated.

Hugh Kevilioc, who succeeded to his father's earldom with all his possessions, had a daughter named Agnes, who became the wife of William, second of that name, Earl of Ferrers and Derby, and thus it is clearly evident how that Earl made himself heir of Peverel and intruded himself into that inheritance,

having purchased Hecham of the King, which had been excepted from the rest of the fee of Peverel in the grant of Henry Duke of Normandy to Ranulph Gernons, and claiming heirship to the estates of Peverel, in right of his wife Agnes, sister and co-heir of Ranulph Blondeville, Earl of Chester, the grandson of the grantee, and not through any marriage with this phantom Margaret Peverel, no trace of whom has ever been found in one authentic document.

The reputed victim of Peverel's machinations is said by King, in his "Vale Royal," to have died after lingering in agonies, "which I suspect to be an absurd translation of the "post multos *agones*" of Gervase of Dover. His words are, "post multos agones militaris gloriæ," and the context proves that the words do not apply to bodily torture, but to struggles or contests as a soldier in pursuit of military glory. (*Vide* Ducange sub *agonia* and *agonizare.*)

What conclusive proof have we that Ranulph, Earl of Chester died of poison at all? "Ut fama fuit" is all Gervase of Dover can say about it.

GEOFFREY DE MANDEVILLE.

This progenitor of one of the noblest and most powerful families on either side of the channel is simply alluded to by Wace as "li Sire de Maguevile" (l. 13,562).

The French antiquaries, whilst agreeing as to the individual present at Hastings, differ respecting the locality whence he derived his name; Mons. le Prévost considering it to be Magneville, near Valonges, while Mons. Delisle reports that it was Mandeville le Trévières, the Norman estates of the Magnavilles, Mandevilles, or Mannevilles, as they were indifferently called, lying partly in the neighbourhood of Creulli, and the rest round Argentan, where, at a later period, they held the honour of Chamboi.

No particular feat of arms is attributed to him by the Norman poet. He is only mentioned as one who rendered great aid in the decisive battle, and we find him in consequence rewarded with ample domains in England at the time of the great survey, amounting to one hundred and eighteen lordships in various counties, of which Walden, in Essex, was the chief seat of his descendants, who became the first Norman earls of that county in the reign of Stephen.

He was also the first Constable of the Tower of London after the Conquest, an office enjoyed by his grandson of the same name, which I mention on account of the interesting fact that, in the charter of the Empress Matilda, which confers this amongst many other honours bestowed upon him, the custody of the Tower of London is granted to him and his

heirs, with the *little castle there* (described in another charter as *under it*) which *belonged to Ravenger.*

This charter in which she creates Geoffrey de Mandeville (grandson of the companion of the Conqueror) Earl of Essex, is stated in a marginal note in Dugdale's Baronage to be "the most ancient creation charter which hath been ever known," and, I may add, for the numberless concessions and privileges recorded in it, the most remarkable.

To return to the first Geoffrey, we learn from his charter of foundation of the Benedictine Monastery of Hurley, in Berkshire, that he was twice married. His first wife Athelaise (Adeliza) being the mother of his heir William de Mandeville, and other children not named; and his second wife, Leceline, by whom he appears to have had no issue.

Mr. Stapleton, in his annotations to the Norman Rolls of the Exchequer, suggests that Adeliza, the first wife of Geoffrey, was sister to Anna, wife of Turstain Haldub, mother of Eudo al Chapel.

HUGH DE GRENTMESNIL.

Of this noble Norman we have considerable information afforded us by Orderic, in consequence of his being one of the founders of the Abbey of Ouche, better known as that of St. Evroult, in which the

historian was professed a monk by the venerable Abbot Mainer, in the eleventh year of his age, by the name of Vitalis (Vital), and in which monastery he lived fifty-six years.

From him we learn that Hugh de Grentmesnil was one of the sons of a Robert de Grentmesnil (now known as Grandmesnil, in the arrondissement of Lisieux) by Hawise de Giroie, which Robert was mortally wounded in the battle between Roger de Toeni and Roger de Beaumont, already mentioned, vol. i., pp. 19, 217.

He fought on the side of De Toeni, and being carried off the field, lingered for three weeks, and then died and was interred without the Church of St. Mary at Norrei, between Grandmesnil and Falaise. His issue by Hawise de Giroie was two sons, Robert and Hugh, between whom he divided his property.

Robert became a monk in the abbey he had assisted to re-edify. Hugh, who was "eminent for his skill and courage," was, through the machinations of Mabel de Montgomeri, banished by Duke William without any real cause of offence in 1058, but recalled from exile in 1063, and intrusted with the custody of the Castle of Neufmarché-en-Lions, from which the Duke, on equally slight grounds, had expelled Geoffrey de Neufmarché, the rightful heir; and nobly forgetful of past

injustice, did the valiant Hugh justify the trust reposed in him, restoring in the course of a year the disturbed district to perfect tranquillity. We next find him amongst the principal combatants in the great battle, but he surely cannot be the person described by Wace as "a vassal of Grandmesnil," who was in great peril during the action in consequence of his horse becoming masterless through the breaking of his bridle-rein in leaping over a bush. He was near falling, and the English perceiving his flight ran towards him with their long axes, but the horse taking fright, and wheeling suddenly round, bore his rider safely back into the ranks of the Normans. Hugh was certainly a vassal of the Duke of Normandy, but a baron of his reputation and power would scarcely be so described by Wace. Mons. le Prévost, however, appears by his note on the passage to consider it refers to Hugh himself, and Mr. Taylor follows him without comment. It may perhaps be argued that there is nothing in the incident itself to give it sufficient importance to be recorded by the poet unless the person endangered was some one of consequence. At all events, Hugh de Grentmesnil was certainly present at Senlac, and no doubt did his devoir, as he was wont to do; for in 1067 we find him one of the principal persons joined with William Fitz Osbern and Bishop Odo in the

government of England during the King's absence in Normandy, and besides the donation of one hundred manors in this country, sixty-five of which were in Leicestershire, he was appointed Viscount (*i.e.*, sheriff) of that county and Governor of Hampshire.

He was one of the Norman nobles who interceded with the Conqueror in favour of Robert Court-heuse, and effected a temporary reconciliation. On the accession of Rufus he espoused the cause of the young duke; but like many others of his rank and country, weary of his vacillations, and disgusted by his general conduct, he ultimately took part against him.

In 1090 we find him in Normandy, in his old age, strenuously opposing the aggressions of the detestable Robert de Belesme, who had erected strongholds at Fourches and at La Conebe, on the river Orme, whence he made inroads on his neighbours, and harried all the country round.

Hugh de Grentmesnil and Richard de Courci, whose domains lay nearest to him, and most exposed to his depredations, were the first to take arms against him. Both these knights were now grey-headed, but their spirit was unbroken, and their intimate connection strengthened the bond of friendship between them, Richard de Courci, the son of Richard, having married

Rohesia, daughter of Hugh. Matthew, Count of Beaumont-sur-l'Oise, brother-in-law of Hugh, William de Warren, second Earl of Surrey, with many other knights, hastened to their support, eager to exhibit their prowess in such a field. Theobald, son of Walter de Breteuil, called "the White Knight," because his steed and appointments were all white, and his brother-in-arms Guy, called "the Red Knight" for a similar reason, were slain in some of these encounters; but Robert de Belesme finding that he was unable to cope alone with his brave and resolute opponents, prevailed on the Duke of Normandy, by humble supplications and specious promises, to march to his assistance. In the month of January, 1091, the Duke accordingly laid siege to Courci-sur-Dive; but unwilling to come to extremities with his great nobles, took no measures for closely investing the place. De Belesme, however, used every means by force and stratagem to get possession of the castle. He caused a huge machine, called a belfry (berfradum), being a wooden tower containing a number of stages or floors, and moving on wheels, to be constructed and rolled up to the castle walls, filled with soldiers, who could leap from it on to the battlements, or fight hand to hand with the defenders; but the device proved in vain, for as often as he attempted an assault, a powerful force

from Grentmesnil hastened to the rescue, and drew him off from the attack.

In one of these conflicts the garrison during a rally took prisoners William, son of Henry de Ferrers (who fought at Hastings), and William de Rupière, whose ransoms were a great assistance to the besieged; but, on the other hand, the besiegers captured Ivo, one of the sons of Hugh de Grentmesnil and Richard Fitz Gilbert de Clare, the latter of whom did not long survive the horrors of the dungeon to which De Belesme consigned him.

An oven had been built outside the fortifications, between the castle gate and De Belesme's belfry, and there the baker had to bake the bread for the use of the garrison, the siege having been begun so suddenly that the inhabitants of Courci had no time to construct one within the walls. The thickest of the fight was therefore often around this oven, for the men of Courci stood in arms to defend their bread while De Belesme's followers endeavoured to carry it off. This led occasionally to a general engagement, in which there was much slaughter, without special advantage to either side; but in one of them, the besiegers having repulsed their assailants, set fire to the belfry, and succeeded in destroying it.

Hugh de Grentmesnil, who did not bear arms him-

self, on account of his advanced age, was much distressed by the long continuance of the siege, and in consequence sent the following message to the Duke of Normandy:—"I long served your father and grandfather, and suffered much in their service; I have also always been loyal to you. What have I done? In what have I offended you? How have I merited at your hands this hostility? I openly acknowledge you as my liege lord, and on that account will not appear in arms against you; but I offer you two hundred livres to withdraw when it may suit your pleasure for one single day, that I may fight Robert de Belesme!" Orderic has not acquainted us with the reply of Court-heuse to this manly appeal of the chivalric old warrior, who, as he mentions his service to the Duke's grandfather, could not at this period have been much under eighty.

At all events, neither the letter nor the mediation of Gerrard, Bishop of Séez, who took up his abode at the Convent of Dive during the siege, in the hope of restoring peace in his diocese, had any effect upon either the Duke or Robert de Belesme; but the arrival of King William (Rufus) with a great fleet caused them to decamp with all haste and disband their forces, each man returning to his own home.

Three years afterwards, Hugh de Grentmesnil was again in England, and worn out with age and infirmity, finding his end approaching, assumed, in accordance with the common practice of the period, the habit of a monk, and expired six days after he had taken to his bed, 22nd of February, 1094, according to our present calculation, and presumably in the city of Leicester.

His body, preserved in salt and sewn up in the hide of an ox, was conveyed to Normandy by two monks of St. Evroult, named Bernard and David, and honourably buried by the Abbot Roger on the south side of the Chapter House, near the tomb of Abbot Mainer.

Arnold de Tillieul, his nephew, caused a marble slab to be placed over his grave, for which Orderic tells us he himself furnished the Latin epitaph in heroic verse, with which he obliges his readers; but as it is simply laudatory I will not inflict it on mine, observing only that it is a relief to feel that in this instance the praise appears to have been truly deserved, as I find nothing recorded of Hugh de Grentmesnil that does not redound to his credit.

In his youth we are told he married a very beautiful lady, Adeliza, daughter of Ivo, Count of Beaumont-sur-l'Oise, by his first wife Judith, with whom

he had Brokesbourne, in Herefordshire, and three lordships in Warwickshire.

She died at Rouen seven years before her husband, and was buried in the Chapter House of St. Evroult,* having had issue by him five sons and as many daughters—namely, Robert, William, Hugh, Ivo, and Aubrey; Adeline, Hawise, Rohais, Matilda, and Agnes—none of whom except Robert lived to an advanced age, and he, although thrice married, died without issue in 1136. Hugh died young. William, Ivo, and Aubrey forfeited their reputation for bravery by their dishonourable and ludicrous escape from Antioch, which obtained for them the name of rope-dancers. With the exception of Hawise, who died unmarried, his daughters became the wives of noble knights: Adeline, of Roger d'Ivri, Rohais, of Robert de Courci, Matilda, of Hugh de Montpincon, and Agnes, of William de Say.

RICHARD DE COURCI.

I have just mentioned Robert, the son of this Richard, and son-in-law of Hugh de Grentmesnil, and shall conclude this chapter with a notice of this

* A charter of her son Ivo indicates that she was buried at Bermondsey.

memorable family, the direct male descendant of which wears at the present day the coronet of a baron, one of the very few instances that can be quoted of an unbroken line of nobles in the same family from the Conquest.

Wace simply mentions "Cil de Corcie" amongst those knights who "that day slew many English."

Courci is in the arrondissement of Falaise, and I have just described its siege by Robert Court-heuse in 1091, at which time it was held by Richard de Courci, the companion of the Conqueror. He was the son of Robert de Courci, who was one of the six sons of Baldric the Teuton, or German, Lord of Bacqueville-en-Caux, and held the office of Archearius under Duke William. He married a niece of Gilbert Comte de Brionne, grandson of Richard first Duke of Normandy, name unknown, by whom he had six sons and two daughters, and here we have an example of the difficulty the general reader would experience in endeavouring to form an idea of the family and connections of many important personages with whose names he incidentally meets in the popular histories of England. Robert, the third of these six sons, alone bore the name of De Courci: all the rest assumed surnames similarly derived from their particular properties or the place of their birth. The eldest, Nicholas, succeeding

to his father's fief of Bacqueville-en-Caux, was thence called Nicholas de Bacqueville. The second son, Fulk, was named Fulk d'Aunou from his fief of Aunou le Faucon, arrondissement of Argentan. Richard, the fourth son, was the first of the famous name of Nevil, derived from his fief of Neuville-sur-Tocque, in the department of the Orne and the canton of Gacé. Baldric, fifth son, was surnamed de Balgenzais, from his fief of Bouquence or Bouquency. The youngest, Vigerius or Wiger, was named after an uncle, and also called Apulensis, having been born, it is presumed, in Apulia. Who, meeting with the names of these noble and powerful Normans in their study of English history, would, without such an explanation, suspect they were all sons of the same father, and cousins of William the Conqueror on their mother's side? Elizabeth, named after her aunt, who was a nun at St. Amand, married Fulk de Boneval; and Hawise was the wife of Robert Fitz Erneis, who fought and fell at Senlac.

It was Robert, the third son of Baldric the Teuton, as I have said, who assumed the name of De-Courci from his inheritance of Courci-sur-Dive, and transmitted it to his immediate descendants. His son Richard married a lady named Guadelmodis, and was the Sire de Courci present at Hastings and Senlac. For his services he received from the Conqueror the

barony of Stoke in the county of Somerset, and the manors of Newnham, Setenden, and Foxcote, in Oxfordshire. At least, he held them at the time of the great survey.

We hear no more of him during the reign of the elder William, though it is improbable he could have remained quiescent during all the commotions that were constantly convulsing the duchy; but whether he fought or not we may be satisfied that he remained loyal to the Conqueror, and to his successor William Rufus, whose opportune arrival in Normandy caused Robert Court-heuse and Robert de Belesme to raise the siege of Courci, as before related.

Both he and his friend and neighbour Hugh de Grentmesnil, who was now connected with him by the marriage of their children, were considerably advanced in years, and like Hugh, the Lord of Courci, may not have mingled in the *mêlée;* but it is strange not to find Robert's name mentioned amongst the gallant defenders of his own property and that of his father-in-law.

Besides this Robert, whose line was not of long endurance, Richard had a second son named William, from whom descended the famous John de Courci, Earl of Ulster, and the present Lord Kingsale, who enjoys the *enviable* privilege of wearing his hat in the

presence of his sovereign, traditionally granted by King John to the said Earl of Ulster in reward for the following service.

Philip Augustus, King of France, having proposed to King John to settle the difference between the Crowns of England and France respecting their pretensions to the Duchy of Normandy by single combat, had appointed on his side a champion. King John, who had unwarily fixed the day, could find no one of sufficient strength or prowess to oppose the Frenchman but the Earl of Ulster, who, at the instigation of Hugh de Lacy, had been dispossessed of his estates, and was a prisoner in the Tower. Having accepted the challenge for the honour of his country, he appeared in the lists on the appointed day, and so terrified the French champion by his gigantic form and warlike demeanour that, on the third sounding of the trumpets, he wheeled about, broke through the lists, and galloping to the coast took ship for Spain, leaving De Courci victor without a blow. To gratify King Philip, who desired an exhibition of his extraordinary strength, the Earl directed a massive suit of mail surmounted by a helmet to be placed on a block, and at one stroke he cleft armour and helmet asunder, his sword entering so deep into the wood that no one present could pull it out with both hands, but he did in an instant with

one. King John being well satisfied with his extraordinary service restored him to his titles and estates, and bade him ask besides anything it was in his power to grant, to which the Earl replied, that he had titles and estates enough, but desired that he and his successors, the heirs-male of his family, might have the privilege, their first obeisance being paid, to remain covered in the presence of him and his successors the Kings of England, which was granted accordingly. There is about as much truth in this story as there was in the one formerly told by the warders in the Tower of London, who were wont to show a remarkably large suit of plate armour of the time of Henry VIII. as being that of the very redoubtable John de Courci aforesaid.

The King of France, Philip Augustus, never set foot in England. William II., King of Scotland, never saw King John, save on the one occasion when he did homage to him at Lincoln. De Courci was never restored to his estates by John, and no one knows when a privilege, as worthless as it is unmannerly, was conferred, or by whom or on what authority it was first claimed and exercised.

Almericus, the twenty-third Baron Kingsale, astonished King William III. by presenting himself with his hat on, but had the good taste to reverse the

custom by remaining *uncovered* after the first assertion of his privilege.

George II. good-humouredly observed to Gerald, cousin and successor of Almericus, that, although his lordship had a right to wear his hat before him, he had no right to do so before ladies.

Let us trust that good sense and good taste will combine to abolish an absurd custom, for the observance of which no credible authority can be produced —no dignity lost by its discontinuance.

CHAPTER IV.

WILLIAM DE ALBINI.	RAOUL TAISSON.
WILLIAM MALET.	WILLIAM DE MOULINS.
WILLIAM DE VIEUXPONT.	HUGH DE GOURNAY.

WILLIAM DE ALBINI.

THAT one or more of the family of Aubigny (Latinised into De Albinio, and better known in England as De Albini) "came over with the Conqueror," and fought at Hastings, there can be no question; but Wace, who does not specify the individual, but simply calls him "li boteillier d'Aubignie," has been accused of an anachronism by Mr. Taylor, who considers the office of Pincerna, or butler, to have been first conferred upon the grandson of William by Henry I. *circa* 1100, when for his services to that monarch he was enfeoffed of the barony of Buckenham to hold in grand-sergeantry by the butlery, an office now discharged at coronations by the Duke of Norfolk, his descendants possessing a

part of the barony. The companion of the Conqueror he believes to have been William, the first of that name we know of, or his son Roger, father of the second William] and Nigel de Albini, of whom we have previously spoken (p. 30).

M. le Prévost votes for Roger, who made a donation to the Abbey of L'Essai in 1084. There is no reason why he should not also have been in the battle.

In the absence of conclusive evidence I have headed this chapter with William de Albini, the earliest known of that name, which he derived from the commune of Aubigny, near Periers, in the Cotentin, and with whom the family pedigree commences.

This William married a sister of Grimoult du Plessis, the traitor of Valognes and Val-ès-Dunes, who died in his dungeon in 1047 (vol. i., pp. 25 and 31), and Wace may after all be right in styling him "Le Botellier," as it is probable that he held that office in the household of the Duke of Normandy. By his wife, the sister of Grimoult (I have not yet lighted on her name), he had a son, the Roger d'Aubigny aforesaid, who married Amicia, or Avitia, sister of Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, and of Roger de Montbrai, and is supposed by M. le Prévost to have been with his brothers-in-law in the battle.

Roger d'Aubigny, or De Albini, had issue by his

wife Avitia de Montbrai, five sons: William, known as William de Albini "Pincerna" (*i.e.*, Butler), ancestor of the Earls of Sussex, who married Maud, daughter of Roger le Bigod, and died 1139. Richard, Abbot of St. Albans, Nigel, Humphrey, and Rualon, or Ralph. Nigel, the third son, was heir of Robert de Montbrai, or Mowbray, his first cousin, whose wife he married during the lifetime of her husband by licence of Pope Paschal, and for some time treated her with respect out of regard for her noble parents; but on the death of her brother Gilbert de l'Aigle, having no issue by her, he craftily sought for a divorce on the ground of that very kinship which he exerted so much influence to induce the Pope to overlook, and then married Gundred, daughter of Gerrard de Gournay, by whom he had Roger, who assumed the name of Mowbray, and transmitted it to his descendants, Dukes of Norfolk and Earls Marshal of England; and Henri, ancestor of the line of Albini of Cainho.

To return to the first William, it is clear that his grandsons were mere infants even if born in 1066, and therefore I believe that it was the William, then Pincerna, and probably also Roger, his son, who were companions of the Conqueror in his expedition; Roger's eldest brother William being in disgrace in Normandy at the time, and not restored to favour,

or allowed to enter England before the reign of Rufus, or it may have been Henry I.

Of William de Albini, third son and successor of William II., and Maud le Bigod, a romantic story has been invented to account for the lion rampant subsequently borne by his descendants.

Having captivated the heart of the Queen Dowager of France by his gallant conduct in a tournament at Paris, she offered to marry him, an honour which he respectfully declined, having already given his word and faith to a lady in England, another Queen Dowager, no less a personage than Adeliza, widow of King Henry I. of England. His refusal so angered the French Queen, that she laid a plot with her attendants to destroy him by inducing him to enter a cave in her garden, where a lion had been placed for that purpose; but the undaunted Earl, rolling his mantle round his arm, thrust his hand into the lion's mouth, tore out its tongue, and sent it to the Queen by one of her maids. "In token of which noble and valiant act," says Brooke, in his "Catalogue of Nobility," "this William assumed to bear for his arms a lion gold in a field gules, which his successors ever since continued."

As this third William de Albini died as late as 1176, it is possible he might have assumed armorial

bearings, but the lion was more probably first borne by his son, the second Earl of Arundel of the line of Aubigny, in token of his descent from Adeliza, widow of Henry I., in whose reign we have the earliest evidence of golden lions being adopted as a personal decoration, if not strictly an heraldic bearing.

WILLIAM MALET.

Here again is a memorable personage of whose origin and family little is known. Wace mentions him as "Guillaume ki l'en dit Mallet," but why so called has not even been guessed at. Geoffrey, Count of Anjou, is popularly said to have received his name of Martel from the horseman's hammer, which is assumed to have been his favourite weapon; but this, like many such stories, is unsupported by any substantial evidence, and is contested by the French antiquary, M. de la Mairie, who asserts that Martel is simply another form of Martin, and the well-known charge in heraldry, Martlet, Martelette, or little Martin, or Swallow, appears to corroborate that assertion. Therefore, although the "maillet," a two-headed hammer, was as early known to the Normans as the "martel de fer,"* if, indeed, it were not the

* "L'un tient une épée sans fourre,
L'autre une *maillet*, l'autre une hache."
Guiart., v. 6635.

same weapon, I have no belief in such a derivation, the name being, moreover, borne by the whole family. Whether the companion of the Conqueror was the first so called is unknown. Le Prévost simply says he was the source of a noble race still existing in France, that of Malet de Graville.

The author of "Carmen de Bello" tells us he was partly Norman and partly English, and "Compater Heraldi," which would seem to signify joint sponsor with Harold, *compère*, as the French have it (*vide* Ducange *in voce*).

It would be interesting to discover whose child they stood godfathers to, and why we find him in the ranks of his fellow-gossip;* the knowledge of that fact might reveal to us many others. Was it in England or in Normandy that he stood at the font with Harold? If in the latter, it must have been in 1062, during the enforced visit of Godwin's son to Duke William, the year in which Adela was born. Is it possible that Harold and William Malet were her godfathers? Guy, of Amiens, Matilda's almoner, would certainly be cognizant of that fact.

His name, however, is not met with, I believe,

* From the Saxon God-syb, a relation in God. There was formerly a spiritual kinship supposed to exist between a child and its sponsors expressed by the word *gossiprede*.

either in Saxon or Norman annals previous to the invasion, when we hear of his valour and his peril. "Guillaume, whom they call Mallet, also threw himself boldly into the midst. With his flaming sword he terrified the English. But they pierced his shield and killed his horse, and he would have been slain himself, when the Sire de Montfort and William de Vez-Pont (Vieuxpont) came up with a strong force, and gallantly rescued him, though with the loss of many of their men, and mounted him on a fresh horse" (*Roman de Rou*, l. 13,472-85).

We next hear of him as the person appointed by the Conqueror to take charge of the body of Harold, which had been discovered by the swan-necked Eadgyth, and to bury it on the sea-shore; his selection for that purpose would seem to have some connection with the curious statement of Bishop Guy, as from his previous knowledge of the Saxon King, and the spiritual brotherhood which is said to have existed between them, he may have been considered by William to have the best claim to the melancholy honour after the mother, to whom it had been sternly refused.

After this we find him mentioned as accompanying the newly-seated sovereign in his expedition to the North, and the reduction of Nottingham and York

(1068), in which year Malet was rewarded with the shrievalty of Yorkshire, and large grants of land in the county. He was in York the following year, and governor of the castle (newly built by the Conqueror) when it was besieged by the Northumbrians, led by the Saxon prince Edgar. The citizens having joined the insurgents, William Malet, sorely pressed, sent to the King for assistance, without which he assured him he should be compelled to surrender. The King arrived with a powerful force in time to raise the siege and take fearful vengeance on the besiegers, as well as on the city and its inhabitants. Again, with Gilbert de Ghent he was in command in York when the Danes assaulted it in 1069 and in conjunction with the Earls Waltheof and Gospatric burnt the city, slew three thousand Normans, and took prisoners Gilbert de Ghent and William Malet, with his wife and two of their children.

How long he remained in captivity does not appear, nor where or at what time or under what circumstances he died. Lucia, widow of Roger Fitz Gerald, and subsequently Countess of Chester, is stated, in a grant of King Henry II., to have been niece of Robert Malet and of Alan of Lincoln; and this Robert is said to have been the son of a William Malet, slain in 1069, the period at which our William Malet was

taken prisoner at York. Another William Malet, set down as the son of Hesilia Crispin, died an old man in the Abbey of Bec; but there is no identifying either with the companion of the Conqueror, though each has a claim to the distinction, for our William, the sheriff of Yorkshire and *compère* of Harold, certainly had a son and heir named Robert, and a sister of William Crispin, named Hesilia, is variously asserted to have been the mother or wife of the William Malet who fought at Senlac.

He was a witness to a charter of King William to the Church of St. Martin-le-Grand in London, and is therein styled "Princeps." He also gave Conteville in Normandy to the Abbey of Bec,* which indicates some connection with Herluin and Herleve. How came he possessed of Conteville? We know that Herluin had been previously married, and had by his first wife a son named Ralf. Was that first wife an Englishwoman, and had she a second son named William, heir eventually to Conteville? Glover, in his invaluable collections, has jotted down the subscribing witnesses to a charter by a Gilbert Malet, who styles himself "Dapifer Regis," and we find amongst them William Malet, his heir "hærede meo," Robert, and

* "De dono Gulielmi Malet manerium de Conteville cum ecclesiâ et omnibus ejusdem ecclesiæ et manerii pertinentiis suis" (*Neustria Pia*, p. 484).

Ralph, brothers of William, and another William, grandson or nephew of the grantor ("nepote meo"). Unfortunately it is without date; but I am inclined to consider Gilbert a brother of the sheriff, and the William he calls his nephew, the youngest of the two sons of the sheriff, who were taken prisoners with him at York; the other being Robert, who succeeded him, obtained the honour of Eye in Suffolk, and at the compilation of Domesday was found to possess two hundred and sixty-eight manors in England, Eye being the chief. His father was then dead, and that is all we at present know for a certainty. If not slain in 1069, he might well be the old man who died in the Abbey of Bec, to which he was a benefactor, for we have no means of guessing his age at the time of the invasion. The smallest contribution to his history would be gratefully received.

WILLIAM DE VIEUXPONT.

The combatant at Senlac who with the Sire de Montfort saved the life of William Malet, as described in the preceding memoir, is named by Wace, who records the incident, "William." M. le Prévost says, authoritatively, that it was Robert de Vieuxpont, and he is followed by Mr. Taylor, who produces no evidence

in corroboration of the assertion of the learned antiquary whose opinion he has adopted, and which appears to have been formed not upon any contemporary documents, but from the simple fact of a Robert de Vieuxpont, or Vipount, as it became anglicised, having been sent in 1073 to Normandy, to the assistance of Jean de la Flèche, as stated by Orderic (lib. iv. cap. 13); but the existence of a Robert de Vieuxpont in 1073 does not convince me that there was not a William, lord of Vieuxpont, at Hastings in 1066. Wace, it is true, cannot be implicitly depended upon for the baptismal names of the personages he mentions as taking part in the great battle; and M. le Prévost has in two or three instances made some valuable corrections of his text on good and sufficient authority; but in this case he cites none in support of his assertion, and therefore, with great respect for his opinion, I venture to differ from him and accept Wace's account, which is uncontradicted by anything within my knowledge, and has great probability in its favour.

William and Robert were favourite names in the family, supposed to have its origin in Vieuxpont-en-Ange, in the arrondissement of Lisieux; and in 1131 there was a William de Vipount, apparently a son of the Robert aforesaid, who claimed certain lands in Devonshire, and agreed that his right to them should

be determined by a trial by battle. A Robert de Vieuxpont, probably his brother, was with the Crusaders at Sardonas, near Antioch, in 1111; and in the 4th of John (1203) we have another William obtaining the King's precept to the Steward of Normandy, to have a full possession of the lordship of Vipount in that duchy, as Robert de Vipount, his brother, had when he went into France after the war.

All these Williams and Roberts are mixed up together by Dugdale in the most inextricable confusion. It is not my duty here to attempt the task of identifying and affiliating them, and they are only mentioned in order to explain my reason for believing that the first Robert we hear of had a brother or perhaps a father named William, who was the companion of the Conqueror mentioned by Wace, a belief which does not preclude the possibility of Robert's presence at Hastings also.

As we hear no more of William after his rescue of William Malet, it is probable that he died previous to 1073, and may indeed have been killed at Senlac; for it is a singular fact that only three Normans of note are named as having fallen in that battle, although hundreds must have done so. That we have no list of the killed and wounded in the Saxon army is not surprising, but that none of the Norman writers should

have thought fit to perpetuate the memories of the noble and gallant knights who perished in that memorable conflict is to me most surprising.

The first Robert is said by Orderic to have been killed at the siege of St. Suzanne in 1085; but M. le Prévost quotes a charter of Henry I. in favour of the Abbey of St. Pierre-sur-Dive, which records his having become a monk in that house.

We hear nothing of the wives of the first Vipounts, nor by what means they became possessed of the lands they held in England, but great accessions of honours and estates were acquired in the reign of King John by a Robert de Vipount, who was high in favour with that sovereign, and had custody of the unfortunate Prince Arthur, taken prisoner in the battle of Miravelt, for his services in which Robert had a grant from the King of the castle and barony of Appleby; and, adhering strictly to John during the whole of his reign, is ranked by Matthew Paris, with a brother named Ivo, amongst the King's wicked counsellors.

This Robert's mother we find was Maude, daughter of Hugh de Moreville, of Kirk Anvald, county Cumberland, who gave divers lands in Westmoreland to the Abbey of Shap, but of which previous Robert or William she was the wife does not appear. Her son, the favourite of King John married Idonea, daughter

of John de Builly, lord of the honor of Tickhill, of which, with all the lands and chattels of his father-in-law, he had livery in 1114, and died in 1228 (12th of Henry III.), being then—notwithstanding his great revenues, the wealth he had amassed by rapine and plunder during the civil wars, and the emoluments derived from the various offices he held, amongst others those of a justice itinerant in the county of York and one of the justices of the Court of Common Pleas—indebted to the King in the sum of 1997*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*, besides five great horses of price for five tuns of wine, which debt was not paid off many years after.

The male line of these Vipounts terminated in the grandson of this Robert, who was slain, as it would seem, in the battle of Evesham, on the side of the rebellious barons under Simon de Montfort, A.D. 1261, when his lands were seized by the King, but were subsequently restored to his two daughters and co-heirs, Isabella and Idonea; the former of whom married Roger de Clifford and the latter Roger de Leybourne, after whose death she re-married with John de Cromwell. Through the match with Clifford the Castle of Appleby and other estates in Westmoreland and Cumberland passed into the family of the Tuftons, Earls of Thanet, and are at present in the possession of Sir Henry Tufton, Bart.

RAOUL TAISSON.

We have already heard of a Raoul Taisson, Lord of Cingueleiz, at the battle of Val-ès-Dunes in 1047; descended, it is supposed, from the Counts of Anjou, and the founder of the Abbey of Fontenay. Three Lords of Cingueleiz were so named in succession during the time of the Conqueror. The "Raol Teisson" mentioned by Wace as present at Hastings, is presumed to have been the second, and the son of the combatant at Val-ès-Dunes.

The name of "Rodulfi Taisson," the father, is appended to the foundation charter of the Priory of Sigi by Hugh de Gournay before 1035, the other witnesses being Neel the Viscount, Geoffrey the Viscount, William the Count, son of the glorious Robert, Duke of the Normans, and William, "Magistri Comitis," whoever he may be. After Val-ès-Dunes we find him summoned by the Duke to his aid on the invasion of the French in 1054. He is not named in any account of the battle of Mortemer, and was therefore most probably with the Duke himself.

His son, Raoul Taisson II., followed him to Hastings. He is presumed to have been killed in the battle, as no more is known about him, nor of any of his descendants in England, although for some time flourishing

in Normandy, and M. le Prévost speaks of an opulent family existing in France, which claims a descent from the Norman Lords of Cingueleiz.

This Raoul Taisson, the second of the name, married Matilda, daughter of Walter the uncle of King William, who had so carefully watched over his childhood. Both she and her father are subscribing witnesses to the foundation charter of the Abbey of Fontenay, the lady describing herself most explicitly as "Mathildis filia Gualteri avunculo Gulielmi Regis Anglorum." She was, therefore, a first cousin of the Conqueror; but what was the worldly estate of her father Walter does not appear, nor who was the mother of the said Matilda. By her, however, Raoul had a son Jordan and a daughter Letitia,* in whose fortunes we are less interested than in those of their mother and grandfather, some knowledge of which would be invaluable as illustrating a branch of the Conqueror's family which has been singularly neglected by chroniclers and genealogists both past and present, the few facts discovered by the late Mr. Stapleton only whetting our appetite for more.

From the period of the accession of the boy William

* Jordan Taisson married one of the daughters of the last Neil de St. Sauveur (Hardy's Rot. Nom. 16); her name, according to M. de Gerville, was Letitia.

to that of the foundation of the Abbey of Fontenay, we hear nothing of uncle Walter but what his dying nephew relates respecting his care of him when a child.

The marriage of his daughter Matilda with so important and wealthy a person as Raoul Taisson, Sire de Cingueleiz, indicates that Walter held some rank and possessions in Normandy at that period, although they have never been specified.

Who was Walter de Falaise, father of an undoubted companion of the Conqueror, of whom I will next speak in order to continue this inquiry; namely,

WILLIAM DE MOULINS.

William, Lord of Moulins-la-Marche, arrondissement of Mortagne, is mentioned by Wace as one of the combatants at Senlac—

"E dam Willame des Molins" (*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,565);

but neither Le Prévost nor Taylor enlightens us as to his pedigree, the latter merely describing him as the son of Walter of Falaise, as we already knew from Orderic, who is silent respecting the family of his father and his mother. In the absence of any information on the subject, I am strongly inclined to believe that this Walter of Falaise was the Walter son of Fulbert the burgess of Falaise, brother of

Herleve and uncle of William the Conqueror, who with his daughter Matilda, wife of Raoul Taisson, witnessed the foundation charter of Fontenay as already stated.

The title of De Moulins, borne by the son of Walter de Falaise, was obtained by him through his marriage with Alberede or Albrede, daughter and heir of a certain Guitmund, whose hand was bestowed by the Conqueror on William, with the whole of her father's fief of Molines, in reward of his services either at Senlac or elsewhere, he being, as Orderic informs us, "a gallant soldier."

In conjunction with his wife Alberede he was a great benefactor to the Abbey of St. Evroult, bestowing on it the Church of Mahern, with the titles and all the priest's lands and the cemetery belonging to it, the Church of St. Lawrence in the town of Moulines, and his demesne land near the castle, and the Church of Bonmoulines, with all the tithes of corn, the mill, and the oven.

In 1073 he was sent by King William, in company with William de Vieuxpont and other brave knights, to the assistance of John de la Flèche against Fulk le Rechin (the Quarreller), Count of Anjou, and his ally, Hoel V., Duke of Brittany, following himself with a large army; but serious hostilities were prevented by

a mediation which terminated in the Peace of Blanchelande (vol. i., p. 198).

After Albreda had borne him two sons, William and Robert, it appears he divorced her on the plea of consanguinity. This may afford us some clue to the desired information.

William married secondly Duda, daughter of Walcran de Meulent, by whom also he had two sons, Simon and Hugh, who were both cut off by a cruel death, Orderic informs us, leaving no issue.* The divorced Albreda ended her days in a nunnery.

The same author, describing William de Moulines, says "he was too fond of vain and empty glory, in pursuit of which he was guilty of indiscriminate slaughter. It is reported that he shed much blood, and that his ferocity was so great that every blow he dealt was fatal. Through prosperity and adversity he lived to grow old, and, so far as this world is concerned, passed his days in honour. Dying at length in his own castle, he was buried in the chapter-house of St. Evroult."

His son and successor, Robert, fell under the displeasure of Henry I., was banished, and with his wife Agnes, daughter of Robert de Grentmesnil, went to Apulia, where he died; his brother Simon succeeded

* Hugh was drowned in the wreck of "the White Ship."

to his inheritance, and with his wife Adeline ,confirmed all the gifts of his family to St. Evroult. He was probably personally known to Orderic, who evidently knew more of Guitmond and his sons-in-law than he has unfortunately thought it necessary to chronicle.

HUGH DE GOURNAY.

"Le viel Hue de Gournai" may well have deserved that venerable distinction in the year 1066, since the same writer has bestowed it upon him in 1054, when he was one of the commanders in the sanguinary battle of Mortemer (*vide* vol. i., p. 234), and is even then spoken of as "De Gornai le viel Huon." Moreover, he is presumed by M. de Gondeville, the historian of the family, to be identical with the "Hugo Miles" who authorised the gift of the land of Calvelville to the Abbey of Montvilliers by William the Count, son of Robert Duke of Normandy, which he considers must have been before the death of Robert in 1035. Allowing, however, that he was of full age as early even as 1030, though children scarcely in their teens were accustomed to witness charters when they had a contingent interest in the property bestowed, still, admitting he was one-and-twenty at that date, he would not have been sixty at the time of

the Conquest, and though fairly to be described as an old man, the term "le viel" may be held to signify simply "the senior," as it appears that there were three of the family of Gournay present at Hastings, viz., Hue de Gournay, the Sire de Brai le Comte, and the Seigneur de Gournay.

Hugh de Gournay, the second of that name, would be the Seigneur de Gournay at that period, and Hue de Gournay his son the third of the name, who married Basilia, daughter of Gerrard Flaitel, sister of the wife of Walter Giffard, 1st Earl of Buckingham, and widow of Raoul de Gacé. Hugh, his father, Seigneur de Gournay, is described by Wace as being accompanied at Senlac by a strong force of his men of Brai, and doing much execution on the English.

He is said by the Norman chroniclers to have been mortally wounded in a battle at Cardiff in 1074, and carried to Normandy, where he died. There is, however, considerable doubt about their account of this battle, as it is clear that several persons said to have been engaged or slain in it were either deceased long prior to it, or could not possibly have been present; but more of that anon.

The first of the family of Gournay is presumed to have been a follower of Ralf or Rollo, to whom, after the settlement of the Norsemen in Neustria, was

allotted part of the district of Le Brai, the principal places in which were Gournay, La Ferté, Lions, Charleval, and Fleury.

La Ferté was assigned to a younger branch of the house of Gournay before the Conquest. Hugh, the son of Eudes, is reported to have been the first to make Gournay a place of strength. The ancient records of the family ascribe to him the erection of a citadel surrounded by a triple wall and fosse, and further secured by a tower named after him, "La Tour Hue," which was standing as late as the beginning of the 17th century. Such was the reputed strength of this fortress that a rhyming chronicler (William de Brito) declares it was able to resist a hostile attack undefended by a single soldier. A description magnificent enough to take rank amongst the most amusing exaggerations of our transatlantic brethren.

Hugh was succeeded by a Renaud de Gournay, the first of the family mentioned in any charter, who by his wife Alberada had two sons, Hugh and Gautier, the elder becoming Lord of Gournay, and the younger of La Ferté-en-Brai, of which he founded the Priory *circa* 990, by command or request of his brother Hugh, and for the health of the souls of Renaud and Alberada, their father and mother.

This division of the great fief was according to a

Norman custom called *Paragium*, from the younger son being put "*pari conditione*" with the elder. The old "Coutume de Nórmandie" gives this definition of it: "La tenure par *parage* est quand cil qui tient et cil de qui il tient sont pers es parties de l'héritages qui descend de leurs ancesseurs." The younger son in such case was not the feudal vassal of the elder, but held his portion of the fief by equal tenure, the elder, however, doing homage to the over-lord for the whole fief to the seventh generation, when all affinity was supposed to cease.

I have made this little digression, because I consider such explanations of ancient customs most important to readers of history, as accounting for acts and circumstances otherwise inexplicable or liable to misinterpretation and confusion, as in the instance I have already pointed out in my notice of Aimeri de Thouars (vol. i., p. 242).

Hugh II., Seigneur de Gournay, most probably the son of the former Hugh, is the personage I have already mentioned as believed to be "the old Hue" of Wace's Chronicle, and the Hugo Miles who authorised the gift of the land of Calvelville to the Abbey of Montvilliers by William while Count of the Hiemois.

Mr. Daniel Gurney, in the first volume of his sump-

tuous work, "The Record of the House of Gournay," remarks in his notice of this charter that Calvelville, it *seems likely*, is the modern Conteville, so called from this donation by William the Count. If there were any facts to be adduced in support of this otherwise mere fancy, they would be very important, inasmuch as they would enlighten us respecting the parentage and position of Herluin de Conteville, whose name has been preserved to us from the accident of his being "le mari de sa femme." Beatrice, Abbess of Montvilliers, was aunt to Robert Duke of Normandy, William's father, and William Malet, as we have seen, had power to give Conteville to the Abbey of Bec.

This second Hugh was one of the Norman leaders of the fleet of forty ships which accompanied Edward the Saxon Prince, son of King Ethelred, to England in 1035, when, on the death of Knute, he made an attempt to recover the kingdom. The expedition sailed from Barfleur, and landed at Southampton, but was ill received by the English, who had espoused the cause of Harold Harefoot. Edward, seeing the disposition of the country, returned with his fleet to Barfleur, more fortunate than his brother Alfred, who, at the same time making a descent on Dover, was taken prisoner by Earl Godwin, confined in the

Monastery of Ely, had his eyes put out, and died shortly afterwards.

Subsequently we find Hugh de Gournay, one of the victors in the battle of Mortemer, A.D. 1054, and finally at Hastings in 1066, in company with his son Hugh, and his relative, the "Sire de Brai," a title by which the latter Hugh was distinguished in some rolls, and may in this instance have been appropriated to his son Gerrard. I have already alluded to the reported death of the elder Hugh from wounds received in the mysterious battle of Cardiff, A.D. 1074, and will give my reasons for discrediting that account. By Monsieur le Prévost he is said to have become a monk at Bec; but it is suggested that the Hugh de Gournay recorded to have done so, was his son Hugh, third husband of Basilia Flaitel, who also retired from the world, and ended her days there, together with her niece Anfride, and Eva, wife of William Crispin.

The Sire de la Ferté mentioned by Wace (*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,710) was not one of the Gournay family, the last of that branch, lords of La Ferté-en-Bray, having died without issue a monk in the Abbey of St. Ouen at Rouen previous to the invasion.

And now for a word or two about the battle of Cardiff. Mr. Daniel Gurney had his attention drawn to

this subject by the inclusion of the name of Hugh de Gournay amongst the personages connected with it, and following a French account in "L'Histoire et Chronique de Normandie," printed at Rouen by Megissier in 1610, he very naturally questioned the fact of there ever having been such a battle at Cardiff at all.

Having had occasion to examine this subject upon other grounds some years ago, I went deeper into it than my amiable friend had done, and believe I discovered a substratum of truth on which a story irreconcilable with established facts had been constructed.

The Norman Chronicle describes the battle as having occurred in 1074, during the lifetime of the Conqueror, and states that the Danes were met by "Guilhaume le fils Auber" (who was slain in Flanders in 1071), Guilhaume le Roux, the King's son (at that time a boy of fourteen), Roger de Montgomeri, Hue de Mortemer, and the Comte de Vennes; that the Normans were victorious, but suffered great loss. That "Guilhaume le Roux was taken prisoner;" that "Arnoult de Harcourt," "Roger de Montgomeri," "Neil le Vicomte," "Guilhaume le fils Auber," and many others were killed and buried on the spot, and "Hue de Gournay" and the "Comte d'Evreux" were carried, desperately wounded, into Normandy, where

they died soon afterwards; winding up with the information that Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, and the Comte de Vennes retired after the battle with the remainder of their forces to Caerleon.

That this account is a jumble of two or three separate actions is evident from the names introduced in it. The Comte de Vennes was Count Brian of Brittany, who defeated the two sons of Harold and their Irish allies in 1069. Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, was in arms against the Earls of Norfolk and Hereford in 1074, and the battle of Cardiff, according to the Welsh Chronicler, was fought some twenty years later, when "Guilhaume le Roux" was king, and had been lying sick at Gloucester.

In Dr. Powell's continuation of Humphrey Lloyd's description of Wales, translated from the Welsh, and published in 1584, it is recorded under the date of 1094: "About this time *Roger Montgomery*, Earl of Salop and Arundell, William Fitz-Eustace, Earl of Gloucester, *Arnold de Harcourt and Neale le Vicount* were slain between Cardiff and Brecknock by the Welshmen; also *Walter Evereux, Earl of Sarum, and Hugh Earl Gourney were there hurt, and died after in Normandy.*"

That the French account is a garbled version of the above is obvious on comparison of the names and

words I have put in italics with those in the "Chronique de Normandie," where they are almost literally translated; but William Fitz Eustace transformed into William Fitz Osbern, and Walter Evreux into the Comte d'Evreux.

Mr. Gurney, who appears not to have known of this curious record, sufficiently demolished the French account by comparing the dates of the deaths of the combatants with that given of the battle, and a similar test applied to the Welsh one elicits the important fact, that of the three well-known individuals who are named as having fallen in the battle of Cardiff, or died in Normandy from the wounds they received in it, nothing whatever is recorded which can fairly be said to invalidate the statement. None are known to have survived that period, and their deaths are not accounted for in any other manner.

Roger de Montgomeri, the most important person of the group, was, as I have already shown, buried at that precise date, the cause of death not being stated.

Monsieur de Gerville in his notice of the Lords of Nehou mentions the report that Neel Vicomte de Saint-Sauveur was killed at Cardiff in 1074, but corrects the date, and says he died in 1092, and that Geoffrey de Mowbray buried him at Coutances,

confounding him with his successor. As for Hugh de Gournay, in whom at this moment we are more specially interested, the last we hear of him is that he became a monk in Normandy, where he died *some time after* 1085; but nothing is positively known how long after, or what was the cause of his death, and the assertion that he "was hurt" at Cardiff, "and died after in Normandy," is quite reconcilable with the fact, if it be one, that he became a monk there, as it was a common practice in those days for a warrior to assume the monastic habit even *in articulo mortis;* and the same observation applies to Roger de Montgomeri, who died a monk at Shrewsbury in 1094.

Of Arnould de Harcourt, named in both accounts, I have found nothing to affect the question either way, and we have therefore only Walter Evreux, Earl of Sarum, and William Fitz Eustace, Earl of Gloucester, to dispose of.

That there is evidence of the existence of a William Fitz Eustace, probably a son of Eustace, Count of Boulogne, I demonstrated some years ago at Cirencester.* That there ever was a Walter

* *Vide* William of Tyre. Bohemond, Prince of Antioch, in a letter to his brother Roger, mentions another son of Eustace named Hugo. Sir H. Ellis, in his Introduction to Domesday, also mentions a charter of William, the son of Eustace, in the British Museum.

Evreux, *Earl* of Sarum, is still an open question, which I am not warranted in discussing here. We know Hugh was not *Earl* of Gournay; but that does not destroy his identity. In the absence of any positive authority, the simple statement of the Welsh Chronicler, uncontradicted in any important point, and throwing a light upon several obscure points of history and biography, deserves respectful consideration.

Although recorded under the year 1094, it does not fix the precise date of the battle. The words are "*about this time.*" There is nothing, therefore, to prevent our considering it to have been fought in 1092, or before March, 1093, which would reconcile every apparent discrepancy.

CHAPTER V.

WILLIAM DE MOHUN.
EUDO AL CHAPEL.
EUDO DAPIFER.
FULK D'AUNOU.
RICHARD DE NEVIL.

WILLIAM DE MOHUN.

THIS ancestor of the first Earls of Somerset is named by Wace amongst the Norman barons at Senlac, but simply as "le Viel Willame de Moion" (*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,620). Deriving his name from a vill three leagues south of St. Lô, where the remains of the castle were recently to be seen, all we learn of him from the rhyming chronicler is that he had with him many companions, "ont avec li maint compagnon;" but if we were to give any credit to a list handed down to us by Leland ("Collectanea de Rebus Britannicis," Ed. Hearne, vol. i., p. 202), he had a following worthy of an emperor, and deserved the description bestowed upon him by the writer, viz., "le plus noble de tout l'oste." This William de Moion, he tells us, had in his train all the great lords following, as it is written in

the book of the Conquerors. "To wit: Raoul Taisson de Cingueleiz, Roger Marmion le Viel, Monsieur Nel de Sein Saviour, Raoul de Gail, who was a Breton, Avenel de Giars, Hubert Paignel, Robert Berthram, Raol the Archer de Val, and the Sire de Bricoil, the Sires de Sole and de Sereval, the Sires de St. Jean and de Breal, the Sire de Breus and two hundred of his men, the Sires de St. Seu and the Sires de Cuallie, the Sires de Cenullie and the Sire de Basqueville, the Sires de Praels and the Sires de Souiz, the Sires de Saintels and the Sires de Vieutz Moley, the Sires de Monceals and the Sires de Pacie, the seneschals of Corcye and the Sires de Lacye, the Sires de Gacre and the Sires de Soillie, the Sires de Sacre, the Sires de Vaacre, the Sires de Torneor, and the Sires de Praerers, William de Columbieres and Gilbert Dasmeres le Veil, the Sires of Chaaiones, the Sires of Coismieres le Veil, Hugh de Buliebek, Richard Orbec, the Sires of Bonesboz and the Sires de Sap, the Sires de Gloz and the Sires de Tregoz, the Sires de Monfichet and Hugh Bigot, the Sires de Vitrie and the Sires Durmie, the Sires de Moubrai and the Sires de Saie, the Sires de la Fert and the Sire Boteuilam, the Sire Troselet and William Patrick de la Lande, Monsieur Hugh de Mortimer and the Sires Damyler, the Sires de Dunebek and the Sires de St. Clere and Robert Fitz-Herveis, who was

killed in the battle." And this astounding catalogue is wound up by the repeated assurance that "all the above-named seigneurs were in the retinue of Monsier de Moion as aforesaid."

I have copied the list in order that whoever pleases may satisfy himself, as I have done, respecting its origin. It is in fact nothing more nor less than a copy of all the names mentioned in the "Roman de Rou," from line 13,621 to line 13,761, just as they follow each other in the poem; and the assertion that all these noble Normans were "à la retennaunce de Monsier Moion," resulted from the curious blunder of the copyist, who considered the lines

> "Le Viel Willame de Moion
> Ont avec li maint compagnon,"

had reference to the knights and barons named immediately afterwards, all of whom he pressed into the service, and would no doubt have included half the army if an unmistakable full stop and change of subject had not pulled him up short with the death of Robert Fitz Erneis, which he writes incorrectly Herveis. This exposé is necessary to prevent any one from imagining that this list is extracted from some independent authority. "Le livre des Conquerors" turns out to be "Le Roman de Rou."

The services of "Monsier de Moion" were, however,

sufficiently appreciated to obtain for him the grant of the lordships of Clehangre, in the county of Devon, and Sutton, in the county of Wilts, with fifty-five others in the county of Somerset; Dunster Castle being apparently his caput baroniæ and principal residence, near which he founded a priory and made it a cell to that at Bath, giving to it the Church of St. George in Dunster, as also the lordship of Alcombe, with the tithes of all his vineyards and arable lands at Dunster and Karampton.

Of his age at the time of the Conquest we have no means of judging. As I have previously remarked, the epithet "le Viel" may simply signify "the elder," and not imply "old" in the fullest sense of the word.

Writing in the time of his son, Wace would naturally so distinguish him. We do so in similar cases in the present day. He appears to have survived the Conqueror, and was buried in the Priory of Bath. Of his parentage we are equally ignorant. For all I know, he may have been descended from one of the same family as Raoul, surnamed Mouin, the reported assassin of Robert, the Conqueror's father; for the name is spelt indifferently Moion, Moun, and Moyne.

By his wife, whoever she may have been, he had a son named after him; and his son, a third William, was the first Earl of Somerset. In his foundation

charter of the priory at Bruton he distinctly calls himself "Willielmus de Moyne, comes Somersetensis." From the time of the Conquest to that of this Earl, history is silent respecting the deeds of the De Mohuns.

EUDO AL CHAPEL.

There are some doubts as to whom Wace alludes as "le Sire de la Haie," whom he describes as charging impetuously at Senlac, neither sparing nor pitying any, dealing death on all he encountered, inflicting wounds which no skill could cure.

Eudo, or, as Wace calls him in a previous portion of his Roman, Iwun al Chapel, was the eldest son of Turstain Haldub (Halduc, and Haralduc as it is indifferently written) by Emma or Anna his wife, and subscribes himself "Eudo Haldub" in a charter A.D. 1074. At the time of the Conquest he was head of the house of Haie-du-Puits, in the Cotentin, near the Abbey of l'Essay, founded by Turstain (also called Richard) his father.

Eudo married Muriel, a daughter of Herluin de Conteville and Herleve, and sister of the half blood to the Conqueror, who we have seen summoned him to attend the family council held previous to the general assembly at Lillebonne in 1066, together with

Eudo's brothers-in-law, Bishop Odo and Robert Comte de Mortain (vol. i., p. 51). It can scarcely be doubted, therefore, that he accompanied them to England, and was present in the battle. Mr. Taylor inclines to the opinion of M. le Prévost, that the Sire de la Haie of Wace was Ralph de la Haie, seneschal at that period to Robert Comte de Mortain, and it is of course probable that he might have followed his lord to England; but Robert de la Haie, son of the above Ralph, only became Lord of Halnac in Sussex by gift of King Henry I., and the confusion between Eudo al Chapel and Eudo Dapifer, son of Hubert de Rie, which commenced with Orderic, has not been cleared up by either the French or the English annotators of Wace.

Mr. Stapleton, however, in his Notes on the Norman Rolls of the Exchequer, has adduced evidence that dissipates the doubts expressed by Mr. Taylor respecting the precise way in which the Haies succeeded to Eudo cum Capello. Robert, son of Ralph de la Haie, Dapifer to Robert Count of Mortain, married Muriel, the daughter and heir of Eudo. The charter quoted by Mr. Taylor from Gallia Christiana, which describes Robert de Haie, son of Ralph, seneschal to Robert Comte de Mortain, as the grandson (nepos) of Eudo, Dapifer to *King William*, has contributed to the confusion, as Robert de Haie was son-in-law to

Eudo al Chapel, Dapifer to William Duke of Normandy, and in no way appears related to Eudo, son of Hubert de Rie, Dapifer to the King of England, with whom it seems to have been his fate to be confounded.

Robert's mother, wife of Ralph, appears to have been Oliva, a daughter of William de Albini Pincerna, the second of that name.

EUDO DAPIFER.

There is no satisfactory evidence of this celebrated Norman having fought at Senlac, although it has been suggested that Wace may have designated him as the Sire de Préaux—"Cil de Praels," of which Eudo was undoubtedly possessed in 1070. M. le Prévost, therefore, who himself furnishes us with this information, for which he acknowledges his obligation to M. Hénault, is rather inconsistent in at the same time charging the poor poet with "a gross anachronism," on the ground that the house of Préaux was a junior branch of the family of Cailli, which had only just been detached from it at the period Wace wrote, A.D. 1160; for if the evidence ("titre") discovered by M. Hénault be trustworthy, Eudo Sire de Préaux in 1070 may well have been so four years previously, and at any rate we know that he died in

his Castle of Préaux in 1120, which is of itself a sufficient answer to M. le Prévost's objection, and as he himself records that fact, his note on the subject * is incomprehensible.

But to our memoir. This Eudo was the fourth son of Hubert de Rie, the loyal vassal who saved the life of Duke William in his flight from Valognes by mounting him on a fresh horse, and misleading his pursuers, who were close upon his heels (*vide* vol. i., p. 23). Three of Hubert's four sons were directed by him to escort the Duke, and not leave him till he was safe in Falaise. Whether Eudo was one of the three we know not, as Orderic does not name them; but as they must all have been young at that time, and Eudo the youngest of the four, it is probable that Ralph, Hubert, and Adam were the guides and guardians of their youthful prince, themselves not much his seniors.

Whether all four were in the Conqueror's army we have at present no means of ascertaining, but we find them all in England, and, if we may trust our authority, their father also immediately after William was possessed of the crown.†

* Roman de Rou. Tom. ii., p. 250.

† History of the foundation of St. Peter's, Colchester. Cotton. MS. Nero, D 8.

The account from which we derive it is rather apocryphal. In the time of King Edward the Confessor, we are told, Hubert de Rie, a trusty servant to William Duke of Normandy, being by him sent on a mission to that king when he lay on his death-bed, came with a pompous equipage* into England, and after conference with King Edward, returned to the Duke with certain tokens by which he was declared by that King his heir to the crown of this realm, viz., a sword, in the belt whereof were enclosed the relics of some saints, a hunter's horn of gold and the head of a mighty stag, for which service the Duke promised Hubert he should be steward of his household.

But, continues the writer, when Duke William had got the crown, fearing that disturbances might arise in Normandy, and well weighing the sagacity in counsel and dexterity in action of this Hubert, he sent him thither to have an eye to that danger, and soon after him his sons Ralph, whom he had made Castellan of Nottingham, Hubert, governor of the Castle of Norwich, and Adam, to whom he had given large possessions in Kent; the which Adam was first

* "Cum pompa magna, equis phaleratis et frematu terribilibus, hominibus serico indutis et colore vestrum spectabilis." Such an embassy would scarcely have escaped the notice of the Saxon chroniclers.

appointed by the King to be one of the commissioners for the compilation of the great survey, 1085.

But Eudo, the fourth son, continuing here in King William's service, obtained from him divers lordships in sundry counties, viz., in Essex twenty-five, in Hertfordshire seven, in Berkshire one, in Bedfordshire twelve, in Norfolk nine, and in Suffolk ten; and personally attending the court it so happened that William Fitz Osbern, then steward of the household, had set before the King the flesh of a crane scarce half roasted, whereat the King took such offence as that he lifted up his fist and had stricken him fiercely but that Eudo bore (warded off) the blow. Whereupon Fitz Osbern grew so displeased as that he quitted his office, desiring that Eudo might have it. To which request the King, as well for his father Hubert's demerits and his own, at the desire of Fitz Osbern readily yielded. Of this story, which I have quoted nearly verbatim from Dugdale,* my readers may believe as little as they please respecting the embassy of Hubert to England, and the gifts and bequest of Edward the Confessor, which if true would not have been kept secret by William, whose special interest it was to promulgate the dying declaration of the King of England.

* Baronage, vol. i. p. 109. The detailed account is to be found in his Monasticon, vol. ii. p. 889.

The anecdote about the ill-roasted crane is not improbable, and is at least characteristic, and may have partly influenced the Conqueror in his decision to send Fitz Osbern to Normandy in 1070 (*vide* vol. i. p. 178), for he could ill spare at any time the personal attendance of a trustworthy "cousin and councillor," like the newly created Earl of Hereford.

It is clear, however, that Eudo became Dapifer after the departure of the Earl for Normandy, and for seventeen years enjoyed the favour of his sovereign, and being in attendance on the dying Conqueror at Rouen, was mainly instrumental to the securing of the crown to Rufus, whom he accompanied to England, and by his representations obtained from William de Pontarche the keys of the treasury at Winchester, wherein the regalia, as well as the money, was deposited. Thence he hastened to Dover, and bound the governor of the castle by a solemn oath that he would not yield it to any one but by his advice.

Pevensey, Hastings, and other maritime strongholds he managed to secure in like manner, pretending that the King, whose death was still rumoured in secret, would stay longer in Normandy, and desired to have good assurances of the safety of his castles in England from himself, his then steward.

Returning to Winchester he publicly announced the death of the Conqueror; so, while the nobles were consulting together in Normandy respecting the succession, William II., by Eudo's policy, was proclaimed King in England.

His great service was duly appreciated by Rufus, in whose favour he remained during his whole reign, and in 1096-7 founded the Church of St. Peter's at Colchester, he himself laying the first stone, Rohesia, his wife, the second, and Gilbert Fitz Richard de Clare, her brother, the third.

On the death of Rufus he was coldly looked upon by the new King, Henry, who suspected him of being a partisan of his brother Robert Court-heuse, but subsequently was reconciled to him and visited him when he was dying in his Castle of Préaux, and advised him as to the disposition of his temporal estates.

To his Abbey at Colchester, wherein he desired to be buried, he bequeathed one hundred pounds in money, his gold ring with a topaz, a standing cup and cover adorned with plates of gold, his horse and a mule, and in addition to the lands he had endowed it with on its foundation, he bestowed on it his manor of Brightlingsie.

His body was brought over to England, and according to the desire expressed in his will, buried at

Colchester on the morrow preceding the kalends of March, 1120 (20th of Henry I.).

By his wife Rohesia, daughter of Richard Fitz Gilbert de Clare or de Bienfaite, and Rohesia, only daughter of Walter Giffard, the first Earl of Buckingham, he left issue one sole daughter and heir, named Margaret, married to William de Mandeville, and mother of Geoffrey de Mandeville, first Earl of Essex, to secure whose services King Stephen and the Empress Maude appear to have bid against each other to a fabulous extent. Dying excommunicated for outrages committed on the monks of Ramsey, his corpse was carried by some Knights Templars into their orchard in the Old Temple at London, arrayed in the habit of the Order, and after being enclosed in lead, hung on a branch of a tree, where it remained until absolution being obtained from Pope Alexander, by the intercession of the Prior of Walden, it was taken down and privately buried in the porch of the New Temple, where his effigy is still to be seen.

FULK D'AUNOU.

"Cil ki ert Sire d'Alnou," another of those Norman seigneurs Master Wace leaves us to identify, is generally held to have been Fulk or Foulques, second son of Baudry le Teuton or Baldric the German, of whom

I have spoken in the memoir of Richard de Courci (p. 85), nephew of Fulk, being the son of his brother Robert. Fulk, like the rest of his brothers, took for their surnames those of their fiefs, and Fulk was at the time of the Conquest Lord of Aunou-le-Faucon, or, as Mons. le Prévost instructs us we should call it, "le Foulcon," a designation it had derived from the repetition of the name of Fulk during several generations of its ancient possessors. However this may be, I think it probable that the Fulk d'Aunou at the time of the Conquest, and of whom there are charters as late as 1082, was a son of the first Sire d'Aunou, and a cousin of Richard de Courci and Martel de Bacqueville, the son of Nicholas de Bacqueville-en-Caux, the eldest of Baldric's children, which said Martel is also included by Wace in his catalogue of the companions of the Conqueror.

"De Bacqueville i fu Martel."—*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,651.

A descendant of this Martel was Dapifer to King Stephen in 1143; but, although we are told by Orderic that the six sons of Baldric the German distinguished themselves by their great valour under Duke William, from whom they received riches and honours, and left to their heirs vast possessions in Normandy, not a single feat of arms or important action of any description is recorded either of them or

their sons, two, if not three, of whom were in the army at Hastings.

A Fulcone *Claudo* is set down in Taylor's List as having contributed forty vessels to William's fleet—

"A Fulcone Claudo xl. naves;"

but unless Claudo be a clerical error, and we should read Alnou, I cannot venture to appropriate the gift to the son of Baldric the Teuton.

Another son of that Baldric was the immediate ancestor of a family unequalled for fame and power by any in England. The name of Nevil is one of the greatest inscribed on the roll of Anglo-Norman chivalry; and though not mentioned by Orderic, Wace, Guillaume de Poitiers, or any other chronicler in their list of the companions of the Conqueror, we cannot, however questionable may be the authority of the Roll of Battle Abbey, challenge the insertion of it as one of the proofs of its inaccuracy.

RICHARD DE NEVIL

was the fourth son of Baldric the German, and so called from his fief of Neuville-sur-Tocque, in the department of the Orne, the arrondissement of Argentan, and the canton of Gacé. The name of his wife is as yet unknown to us, but she bore to him four sons, Gilbert, Robert, Richard, and Ralph. Gilbert,

apparently the eldest, is the "Gilbert Normanus" traditionally said not only to have come over with the Conqueror, but to have been the admiral of his fleet.

This assertion, apparently first made towards the close of the fifteenth century, is reported by Leland on the authority, as he tells us, of "a roulle of the genealogie of the Erles of Westmoreland," but giving us no idea of the date of that roll or the authorities from which it was compiled. At best it can only be looked upon as a family tradition supported, as Mr. Drummond appears to think, by the device of a ship which is to be seen on the seal of his grand-nephew Henry de Neville, preserved in the Duchy of Lancaster Office, and the date of which would be between 1199 and 1216.

My experience in these matters induces me to draw an inference from this fact directly opposed to that of Mr. Drummond. It is my belief, founded on the many analogous examples I have met with in the course of a tolerably long period passed in such investigations, that the tradition of Gilbert de Neville having been an admiral has actually arisen from the appearance of this ship, which, so far from indicating any such office, is nothing more than a device alluding to the family name; *Nef*, in the old French language

signifying a ship, and, therefore, picturing the first syllable of *Nef*ville, as we find *Muscæ* (flies) upon the old seals of the Muscamps, and hosts of similar and much farther-fetched canting devices.

Nearly all the strange stories and bold assertions to be met with in the works of early historical writers are found upon examination to have originated in an attempt to account for such *concetti*, and if Gilbert's uncle did really contribute so large a contingent as forty ships to the invading fleet, the supposition in the present instance seems a very natural one. Monsieur Leopold de Lisle, one of the ablest antiquaries in France, has in a recently compiled catalogue which has been cut in the stone of the western wall of the Church of Dives, introduced a Richard de Neuville amongst the followers of William, but no Gilbert; but neither by him nor by the Viscount de Magny, who has printed the list with some additions in his "Nobiliaire de Normandie," is any authority quoted in support of the statement, and they have probably so distinguished him from observing that the first of the name, and who was a contemporary of Duke William, was Richard de Novavilla, the father of Gilbert; but this Richard had also a son named Richard, and that some of the sons or nephews of the elder Richard were present at Hastings is very probable.

The name of Nevil, it has been confidently asserted, does not appear in Domesday. Like many other confident assertions, it is untrue. Dugdale, who states this, and those who have followed him, have overlooked the name of Ralph Nevil, who held Thorpe of Turold, Abbot of Peterborough. Sir Henry Ellis has also omitted the name in his "Introduction" and indexes. It occurs however in the Clamores in Westriding, county Lincoln, and if Ralph the bishop's man be identical with the Ralph Nevil of Thorpe, as there is reason to believe, he was tenant of several other lands at the time of the survey, and we have seen that the youngest brother of Gilbert was named Ralph.

Be this however as it may, it is no disparagement to the family of Nevil to hesitate, in the absence of positive authority, to number their direct ancestor amongst the leaders of that famous host; for many of the greatest men in Normandy set down in the catalogues as having fought at Senlac are now known to have first set foot in England after Duke William had secured the crown.

Gilbert, the traditionary admiral, was the direct progenitor of Isabella de Neville, wife of Robert Fitz Maldred, Lord of Raby, and sole heir to her brother, the Henry de Neville before mentioned.

From her son Geoffrey Fitz Maldred, who assumed

his mother's name but retained his father's arms, sprang the magnificent tree the branches of which are truly said to have overshadowed the land. This Saxon line of Nevil has given to England two queens, a Princess of Wales, a mother of two kings, a Duke of Bedford, a Marquis of Montacute, Earls of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Salisbury, Kent, Warwick, and Montacute; Barons Nevil, Furnival, Latimer, Fauconberg, Montacute, and Abergavenny; Duchesses of Norfolk, Exeter, York, Buckingham, Warwick, Clarence, and Bedford; a Marchioness of Dorset; Countesses of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Arundel, Worcester, Derby, Oxford, Suffolk, Rutland, Exeter, Bridgewater, and Norwich; Baronesses de Ros, Dacre, Scrope, Dovercourt, Mountjoy, Spencer, Fitz Hugh, Harrington, Hastings, Comyn, Willoughby de Broke, Hunsdon, Cobham, Strange, Montacute, and Lucas; nine Knights of the Garter, two Lord High Chancellors, two Archbishops of York, a Bishop of Salisbury, of Exeter, and of Durham!

I regret that the nature and limits of this work debar me from particular notice of many members of this wonderful family, the above remarkable list of illustrious descendants being of itself a departure from the rule I have generally observed of confining my annotations to the origin and actions of the actual

companions and contemporaries of the Conqueror. Memoirs of "the Peacock of the North" and "the King-maker" would alone demand a volume for their illustration; and it is unnecessary to point out the impossibility of doing similar justice to the many distinguished descendants of other families whose ancestors are recorded to have been present with Duke William at Hastings, and would have equal claims on my consideration.

CHAPTER VI.

NEEL DE SAINT-SAUVEUR.
WILLIAM DE ROUMARE.
THE CHAMBERLAIN OF TANKERVILLE.
URSO D'ABITOT.
WALTER AND ILBERT DE LACY.
ROBERT AND IVO DE VESCI.
EUGUENULF DE L'AIGLE.

NEEL DE SAINT-SAUVEUR.

M. LE PRÉVOST, the French annotator of Wace, is disinclined to believe that Neel le Vicomte, whom we have seen in arms against Duke William at the battle of Val-ès-Dunes (vol. i. p. 30), was fighting in his cause at Senlac; and Mr. Taylor, in his English version, does little more than cite Le Prévost's opinion.

The reasons of the latter are of no great weight: simply that the presence of Neel at Hastings is not vouched for by any contemporary authority, an objection that would equally apply to three-fourths of

the persons who undoubtedly were there—and that the name of "Sanzaver" in Brompton's List is not a corruption of Saint-Sauveur, but of Sanzavier (Sans-avoir), a family which established itself in England at the time of the Conquest, and of whom some charters are to be found in Dugdale's "Monasticon."

Surely this is very illogical. Brompton's inclusion of the name of Sanzavier in his List, which is as little to be relied upon as any other, does not disprove the presence of Neel de Saint-Sauveur in the army of William, any more than the silence of Guillaume de Poitiers, or the other historians of the Conquest who merely mention a few of the principal leaders and contradict each other about them. That Wace is in error requires some much stronger argument, and I think I can show that probabilities are at least in his favour.

He speaks of the Barons of the Cotentin, of which province Neel was the Viscount, that he was at the head of a company—"Jost la cumpaigne Neel" (l. 13,626), and that he exerted himself greatly to gain the love and favour of his feudal lord, vigorously assaulting the English, overthrowing many by the poitrail of his horse, and speeding, sword in hand, to the rescue of many barons (l. 13,489). It is quite clear that Wace knew well enough whom he was

describing: and now let us see what evidence we can find to support him.

It is well known that after the "Noble Chef de Faucon," as he was called, unwillingly retreated from Val-ès-Dunes, he was banished by Duke William, and took refuge in Brittany, that he was subsequently pardoned and restored to his estates, at what time is not exactly ascertained, but most likely at the moment the politic Duke felt the importance of such assistance as the valorous Viscount could afford him in his projected expédition; and, consequently, we find him at the head of a company, exerting himself to deserve the favour of the suzerain who had forgiven him his former rebellion.

That he is not mentioned in "Domesday" is, as Mr. Taylor admits, to be accounted for by the supposition that he died previously to its compilation; and that supposition receives support from the fact that his son and successor, the last Neel de Saint-Sauveur, died in 1092, seven years afterwards, as is proved by the desire of his relative, Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, to attend his funeral ("Mem. Ant. Norman." i. 286, the bishop himself dying the following year.

According to the Welsh Chronicles, as transmitted to us by Humphrey Lloyd and Dr. Powell, Neel the Viscount was one of the slain in the battle

of Cardiff, A.D. 1094 (p. 116). Mons. de Gerville, following the French account, says 1074, but afterwards, as I have already mentioned, corrects as he imagines this date, substituting that of 1092; evidently confounding him with his son and successor above mentioned.

The more critically the Welsh account of the battle of Cardiff is examined, the more does the general truth of the story appear, and if the last Neel the Viscount was killed in Wales in 1092, in company of Roger, Earl of Shrewsbury, and Arnold de Harcourt, there is every probability that his father was a companion of the Conqueror in 1066.

But Wace names also a "Sire de Neahou" amongst the combatants at Senlac, and it is a question whether he is alluding to Neel de Saint-Sauveur by another title, or to some distinct individual. The fief of Nehou, in the arrondissement of Valognes, received its name from Neel, an ancestor of the Saint-Sauveur family, Nehou signifying Neel's Hou or Holm, *i. e. Nigelli Humus.* On the banishment of Neel the Viscount in 1047, Nehou is said to have been given by Duke William to Baldwin de Meules; but it could not have been at that period, as Baldwin and his brother Richard were then refugees in Flanders, and not received into the Duke's favour until 1053. Was

Nehou excepted when William restored to Neel his estates previous to the Conquest, or did it pass to the Rivieres (De Redvers, Rivers) on the death of his son, the last of the family, in 1092? I shall return to this subject when noticing the Vernons (*vide* p. 205), who were Sires de Nehou from the end of the eleventh to the end of the thirteenth century.

WILLIAM DE ROUMARE.

This is supposed to be another inaccuracy of Master Wace's, and we are told by M. le Prévost that we should read Roger instead of William, the Norman poet having substituted the name of the son for that of the father. That William, the son of Roger de Roumare, was not at Hastings I readily admit, but Wace does not say he was. He simply mentions *a* "Dam Willame de Romare," and unless we could clearly show there was no such person then existing, it is hardly fair to tax an almost contemporaneous author with even unintentional misrepresentation. The pedigree of the family of Roumare is one of the most puzzling in the whole catalogue of Norman nobility. The diligent study of forty years has not enabled me to penetrate its mysteries. Edward of Salisbury, one of its most important members, has still to be satisfactorily affiliated, and the Roger de

Roumare suggested to be substituted for the William of Wace is equally difficult to identify.

It is almost impossible to move a step in these directions without acknowledging our obligations to the late Mr. Stapleton, who has done so much to elucidate the descent of our Anglo-Norman ancestors.

To him we are indebted for the information that previous to the Conquest there lived a certain Gerald, who had two wives, Albreda and Emicia, and a son probably by the first, who is presumed to be the Robert Fitz Gerald of Domesday, and the brother of Roger Fitz Gerald, father of William de Roumare, created Earl of Lincoln by King Stephen.

In my paper on "The Family and Connections of Robert Fitz Gerald," the Domesday holder of Corfe, in the county of Dorset (Congress of the British Archæological Association, at Weymouth, 1872), I exposed the absurd story, stereotyped in English History, of the three husbands of Lucia, Countess of Chester, which had been first doubted by the Rev. Mr. Bowles in his "History of Laycock Abbey;" but with the particular object of that Paper I have at present nothing to do.

All that we know of Roger Fitz Gerald, also called De Roumare, or De Romara, is that he was the father of the William de Roumare, first of that name, Earl of Lincoln, by a lady named Lucia, who, through the

neglect of verifying dates, has been confounded probably with her mother, married to her father before she was born, set down as the sister-in-law of her own son, and thus innocently made the cause of considerable trouble to the learned and curious in history and genealogy. The first fact we are in possession of respecting Roger Fitz Gerald is his appearance as Lord of Spalding in the county of Lincoln, before the death of Rufus in 1100. The date of his marriage is unknown, but his son William must have been of full age in 1122, as in that year he claimed of King Henry I. certain lands which his step-father, Ranulf de Briquessart, had surrendered to the King for the earldom of Chester. It is clear, therefore, that Roger was dead and William twenty-one and upwards in 1122, so that the latter could not possibly have fought at Senlac, seeing that he was not born till at least thirty years after it.

It is a question, indeed, whether his father Roger de Roumare was present at Hastings, as we find him Lord of Spalding thirty-four years afterwards, and are informed that he was a *young* man newly married at that period, and I am not aware of any reliable evidence to the contrary.

But, as I have already observed, there is nothing in what we do know to disprove the statement of Wace,

that there was a William de Roumare in the ranks of the Norman army of invasion. Without relying on the statement of Peter de Blois, that Roger Fitz Gerald had an elder brother named William, by whom Lucia was honourably received on her marriage, and whom the writer inaccurately styles Earl of Lincoln, there is every probability that such was the fact.

Gerold de Roumare, the presumed father of Roger, had two wives—Albreda and Emicia; but we have no information whatever that can be relied on respecting the number of his offspring, or, with the exception of Robert, of which of his wives they were the issue.

The above little but important fact is derived from a charter printed in Pommeraye's "*Histoire de l'Abbaye de St. Amand de Rouen,*" fol. 1662, in which a knight named Gerold gives to the Abbey of St. Amand the Church of Roumare for the sake of his own soul and that of his wife Albreda, with the assent of his son and heir Robert, and the attestation of Ralph, brother of Gerold.

The son Robert is supposed to be the Robert Fitz Gerald of "Domesday," and the brother Ralph the Chamberlain of Tankerville, of whom I shall have to speak presently. Roger is not mentioned, nor any William; but if there was a William de Roumare, an

elder brother, he would at the time of the Conquest be "Dom (Dominus) William de Romare," and dying unmarried before the compilation of "Domesday," no traces might have been left of him. At all events I have found nothing to justify the rejection of Wace's statement, and therefore leave the name of William at the head of this chapter as a companion of the Conqueror, convinced that there might be a Robert, but certainly not a Roger, Fitz Gerald in the host at Hastings.

THE CHAMBERLAIN OF TANKERVILLE.

No identification of this noble Norman has yet been made by any of the commentators on the "Roman de Rou," in which alone we find such a personage included in the list of the followers of the Duke of Normandy. Mr. Taylor says, "M. le Prévost rather inconclusively observes that Ralph, William's guardian, was too old and his children too young to be engaged;" and adds, "Ralph's age is hardly itself a competent contradiction to Wace's statement; for his charter giving the Church of Mireville to Jumiéges shows that he was living in 1079. William, his son and successor as Chamberlain, so appears in 1082."

I certainly do not share the opinion of Le Prévost, and am at a loss to know where he found that Ralph, the Chamberlain of Tankerville, was *guardian* to

Duke William. I have just mentioned this Ralph as the supposed brother of Gerold de Roumare and uncle of the William de Roumare I believe to have been at Hastings. Ralph was hereditary chamberlain of Normandy; but which of his family had first exercised that office is at present unknown.

The small Church of St. George, in the vill of that name in the forest of Roumare, first endowed by Duke William, was subsequently rebuilt by Ralph, who is styled by the Duke in his charter of confirmation, "Meus magister Aulaque et Camera mea princeps." "My major-domo or master of the household and first chamberlain." Ralph also had the church re-decorated, and confirmed the grant which his father, Geraldus, and his brothers had given to St. George. A brother of Ralph, named Giraldus, was also an officer of William's household; and it was "Coram Giraldo Dapifer meo" that William, while yet Duke of the Normans, ratified a convention between Hugh de Pavilly and the Canons of St. George, the witnesses being the same Giraldus and Robert his son.

Now we have here two Gerolds, one who simply styles himself "a soldier of Christ," and the other the Dapifer (steward or seneschal) of William, King of the English. We also find one of these Gerolds rejoicing in two wives, named Albreda and Emicia, and

who has a son, Robert, by the first; while the other Gerold had a wife named Helisendis. Whether they were both Gerolds of Roumare, how they were connected, which was the father of Roger de Roumare, and which of Ralph the Chamberlain, has yet to be distinctly proved. The names of Gerald, Robert, Ralph, and William were much too common at that period to be of themselves sufficient identification; but that the chamberlain of Tankerville mentioned by Wace was Ralph, the son of Gerold and father of William the Chamberlain, I think cannot reasonably be doubted. A little more light on the family of the Chamberlain has been thrown by the authors of "Recherches sur le Domesday," in their notice of a personage better known to the readers of English history, namely

URSO D'ABETOT.

The name of "Dabitott" appears in the Roll of Battle Abbey, and although not mentioned by Wace and the other chroniclers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, may fairly be admitted as belonging to one of the companions of the Conqueror, the absence of his baptismal name, however, preventing us from appropriating it to Urso or to his father, Aumary d'Abetot, an appellation derived from the lands of St. Jean

d'Abetot, canton of Calbose, arrondissement of Havre, the lordship of which belonged to the family of Tankerville, as appears from the charter of formation of the college of St. George de Bosherville, to which Ralph Fitz Gerald, in 1050, gave the church and tithes of Abetot for the support of the monks of that college, which was made an abbey in 1124.

This Ralph Fitz Gerald, who is the Chamberlain of Tankerville of the last memoir, was the elder brother of Aumary d'Abetot, above mentioned. Their father being the Gerold who was the husband of Helisendis (not Gerold of Roumare, husband of Albreda), and who probably, as Sire de Tankerville, held the hereditary office of chamberlain to the Dukes of Normandy, which we find his son Ralph and his grandson William enjoying in succession.

Aumary, his younger son, inherited the fiefs of Abetot, and was the father of two sons, Urso and Robert, the latter distinguished as "Despencer," an office which gave a name to the noble families of Le Despencer and Spenser, who trace their descent from the niece of this Robert d'Abetot. Whether Urso was or was not in the army at Hastings there is at present no decisive evidence; but that he was in England shortly afterwards, and made sheriff of the counties of Gloucester and Worcester, there is proof

enough. In 1073 he was one of the King's council, and rendered great service in the suppression of the rebellion of the Earls of Hereford and Norfolk. His character, however, as a spoiler and devastator is amongst the worst recorded of the Norman settlers in England, and he appears to have especially oppressed the Church of Worcester, building so close to it that the mole of the castle encroached on the cemetery of the monks.*

A complaint being made to Archbishop Ealdred, Archbishop of York, he came to Worcester and inspected the work, and sternly reproved Urso, to whom he is reported to have said :—

> "Hightest thou, Urse?
> Have thou God's curse!"

adding, "and mine and that of all holy men unless thou removest thy castle from hence, and know of a truth that thine offspring shall not long hold the land of St. Mary to their heritage."

The prophecy, if not a subsequent invention, was soon fulfilled, for his son Roger d'Abetot, having killed a servant of Henry I., was banished and his confiscated estates given by the King, with the hand of his sister Emmeline d'Abetot, to Walter de Beauchamp of Bedford.

* William of Malmesbury: De Gestis Pontificum.

Urso was living as late as the reign of Henry I., but the date of his death is not recorded. The authors of "Recherches" were mistaken in saying that his wife's name was unknown. She witnessed her husband's charter to Great Malvern as "Atheliza, Vicecomitissi." Of her parentage however, we are ignorant.

The ungallant conduct of the early genealogists toward the female members of our noble Norman families, deprives history of much of its interest and is the cause of endless confusion and perplexity.

WALTER AND ILBERT DE LACY.

Lacie, now called Lassy, the place from which this great Norman family derived its name, is on the road from Vere to Auvray. Of its earlier lords we know nothing, and Wace's "Cil de Lacie" and "Le Chevalier de Lacie," do not enlighten us. Neither do we receive much assistance from his French or English annotators, who refer us to Dugdale and the English genealogists.

From them we learn that a Walter and an Ilbert de Lacy were certainly present at Senlac, though how related to each other they have no evidence, nor can we venture to suggest which was the "Sire de Lacie" of the poet, and which "the Chevalier," if we are to

consider them two distinct personages. That they were brothers, however, is fairly presumable, from the fact that the mother of Ilbert de Lacy, Emma, is named in a charter, and Walter had a daughter Emma, named according to custom after her grandmother. No particular deed of arms is attributed to either; but the Sire de Lacie is named as one of a party of seven or eight knights who charged the English in company, "fearing neither prince nor pope. Many a man did they overthrow, many did they wound, and many a good horse did they kill." As early as the third year of William's reign, 1069, Walter de Lacy was sent into Wales with William Fitz Osbern and other tried soldiers, against the people of Brecknock, led by their Prince of Wales, Rhys ap Owen, Cadogan ap Blethyn, and Meredith ap Owen, whom they attacked and defeated with great slaughter.

Subsequently he assisted Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester, and Urso d'Abitot, then sheriff of that county, in preventing the passing of the Severn by the Earls of Hereford and Norfolk, with the object of effecting a junction of their forces.

His death, however, was not on the field of battle, nor was he shorn a monk in some abbey according to a prevalent custom of the period.

Having founded the Church of St. Peter at Hereford,

and taking much interest in the building, when the work was nearly finished, he mounted a ladder to inspect some portion of it, when his foot slipping, he fell and was killed on the spot (6 kalends of April, 1084).

He was buried in the chapter-house of the Cathedral at Gloucester, to which Emmeline, his wife, for the health of his soul, gave five hides of land at Duntesborne.

By this lady, whoever she was, he left three sons, Roger, Hugh, and Walter, the last a monk in the Abbey of St. Peter at Gloucester; and two daughters, Ermeline and Emma.

Dying before the compilation of Domesday, we cannot be certain what was his reward in lands and honours for the services he had rendered his sovereign; but in that precious record we find his son and successor, Roger, in possession of ninety-six lordships, sixty-five of which were in Gloucestershire, besides four carucates of land lying within the limits of the Castle of Civia, which King William had bestowed on his father. Conspiring, however, against William Rufus, first with Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, and afterwards with Robert de Mowbray, Earl of Northumberland, he was banished the realm and all his lands given to his brother Hugh, the founder of Llanthony Priory, who, dying without issue, left his

great inheritance between his two sisters above named. Ermeline had no children; but Emma,* by a husband unnamed, had issue, a son, Gilbert, who assumed the name of Lacy and became the ancestor of the great lord of Ulster and conqueror of the largest part of Ireland.

ILBERT DE LACY.

The other companion of the Conqueror received for his services at Senlac, the castle and town of Pontefract and all that part of the county of Lancaster then as now called Blackburnshire, with other lands of vast extent, so that at the time of the general survey he possessed one hundred and seventy lordships, the greater portion of them in Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire, and Lincolnshire, and obtained from King William Rufus a confirmation of all those customs belonging to his Castle at Pontefract, which he had enjoyed in the time of King William his father.

By his wife, a lady named Hawise, he left two sons, Robert and Hugh, the former of whom completed the building of the Abbey of St. Oswald at Nostell, the foundation of which was commenced by his father, and amply endowed it.

* An Emma de Lacie, probably the aunt of this Emma, took the veil in the Convent of St. Amand de Rouen before 1069.

This true line of Lacy terminated with the grandson of the above Robert, and the Constables of Chester and the Earls of Lincoln, who assumed the name, inherited the lands and honours, but not a drop of the Lacy blood, as it would be inferred from the polite peerages in which the reader would naturally look for information. As frequently we find it to be the case, they need not the flattering unction applied to them, being descended from equally ancient and valiant progenitors, the families of the De Lizures and the Fitz Nigels, barons of Halton, united in the persons of Richard Fitz Eustace, Constable of Chester, in right of his mother Agnes, the first wife of Henry de Lacy, by her former husband, Eustace Fitz John, and of Albreda, daughter of Robert de Lizures, by the second wife and widow of the said Henry.

ROBERT AND IVO DE VESCI.

Robert and Ivo de Vassy, in the arrondissement of Vere, and anglicised Vesci, are admitted to have been in William's expedition, and to have settled in England. Their family connection with the later Lacies, Earls of Lincoln, induces me to select them for the notice immediately following.

The relations of these two valiant Normans is as uncertain as that of Walter and Ilbert de Lacy, and

the same difficulty exists of identifying the "Sires de Vaccie," mentioned by Wace with the Robert and Ivo aforesaid.

The former we find in Domesday the possessor of nineteen lordships in the counties of Northampton, Warwick, Lincoln, and Leicester, and Ivo equally well provided for, the Conqueror having presented him with the hand of Alda, the granddaughter of Gilbert Tyson, Lord of Alnwick, in the county of Northumberland, who had fallen on the side of Harold at Senlac, and only daughter and heir of his son William, Lord of Alnwick and Malton, to whom she bore an only daughter and heir, Beatrice, the first wife of Eustace Fitz John, whose son, by her named William, assumed the name of De Vesci and bequeathed it to his heirs. His grandson John was the first Baron de Vesci summoned to Parliament by writ, 24th December, 1264; and with William, the illegitimate son of his brother William, summoned by writ as third Baron, 8th January, 1313, and killed at the battle of Sterling in 1315, the title became extinct, and the estates were carried by the heiress of a collateral branch into the family of the Cliffords, Earls of Cumberland, with the exception of Alnwick, which was sold in 1309 to Henry de Percy, and thus became one of the noblest possessions of the Earls of Northumberland.

The present Viscount de Vesci and Lords Fitz Gerald and Vesci claim to be descended from a collateral branch of this family which settled in Scotland.

M. le Prévost, in the supplement to his Notes on the "Roman de Rou," tells us that according to the information furnished to M. Lachesnaye des Bois, the family of Vassy descended from Richard, nephew of Raoul Tête-d'Ane (Raoul de Gacé so called) by his grandson Auvray, who inherited the lands of Vassy, and gave his name to the forest of Auvray; but that unfortunately such persons are only known to us from the traditions of the family at present bearing the name.

M. de Gerville remarks that there is a Vesey near Pontorson, but does not consider that it is in any way connected with the Vassys of Normandy, or the Vescis of England; the latter of whom, wherever they hail from, are undoubtedly descendants of the companions of the Conqueror.

EUGUENULF DE L'AIGLE.

This gallant Norman, called Enguerrand by Wace, was the son of Fulbert de Beine, founder of the Castle of l'Aigle, on the river Risle, arrondissement of Mortain,

and therefore probably one of the knights in the service of Robert, Comte de Mortain.

Wace tells us "he came with shield slung at his neck, and with his lance fiercely charged the English. He strove hard to serve the Duke well for the sake of the lands he had promised him" (*Roman de Rou*, l. 13,592).

Alas! he was not allowed to enjoy what he had so bravely striven to obtain. He is one of the very few whose names have descended to us as having undoubtedly fallen in that memorable battle. Wace, strangely enough, says nothing of his death, which is thus recorded by Orderic: "The Normans, finding the English completely routed, pursued them vigorously all Sunday night, but not without suffering a great loss, for galloping onward in hot pursuit they fell unawares, horses and armour, into an ancient trench, overgrown and concealed by rank grass, and rolling over each other were crushed and smothered. This accident restored confidence to the routed English, for, perceiving the advantage given them by the mouldering rampart and a succession of ditches, they rallied in a body, and, making a sudden stand, caused the Normans severe loss. At this place Enguerrand, Lord of l'Aigle, and many others fell, the number of the Normans who perished being,

as reported by some who were present, nearly fifteen thousand." *

Fifteen thousand! Exactly a fourth of the invading army, the entire force of which is calculated at sixty thousand men. Orderic must surely mean the loss in the whole action, and not in that particular disaster in the "Malefosse," which is still to my mind as uncertain both as regards time and locality as ever. The scene of this celebrated incident has been generally considered to be on one side or other of the hill of Senlac itself; but if Orderic's account is to be credited, and the Normans were hotly pursuing the fugitives all Sunday night, they must have been some miles distant from the field of battle when they floundered into this fatal ravine or morass in the grey light of Monday morning.

The death of Euguenulf is all that concerns us at the present moment, and whether he was slain in the thick of the fight or in the pursuit may never be ascertained. All the accounts we have of the battle are derived from hearsay evidence only, and are as loose and contradictory as such accounts must ever be.

To return to Euguenulf himself. He had for wife a lady named Richeveride, by whom he was father of three sons, Roger, Richard, and Gilbert. Roger, the

* Lib. iii., cap. xii.

eldest, was slain (how is not recorded) about the year 1060, and Orderic informs us that Euguenulf and his wife Richeveride came to St. Evroult in deep grief, entreating the prayers and good offices of the monks for the salvation of their souls and that of their son Roger, which were granted, and thereupon Roger's best horse was offered by his parents to God and the monks. The horse being very valuable, Arnould d'Eschafour begged to have it in exchange for the lands and services of Baldric de Bacquency, whose fief had been ceded to him by the Abbey.

We find, therefore, that six years before the invasion Euguenulf was married, and the father of apparently grown-up sons, and we may therefore conclude that he was between forty and fifty in 1066, when he was killed at Senlac.

A sad fate seemed to pursue his family. On the 18th November, 1085, while the royal army under the command of Alan the Red, Earl of Richmond, was marching to the siege of the Castle of St. Suzanne, a beardless youth, concealed in the bushes on the roadside, shot an arrow, which mortally wounded Richer de l'Aigle, the eldest surviving son of Euguenulf, in the eye. His followers rode up, burning with rage, and seizing the youth, would have put him to death on the spot; but the dying Baron, with a violent effort,

generously exclaimed, "Spare him for the love of God! It is for my sins that I am thus called to die."

The assassin being allowed to go free, the noble lord confessed himself to his companions in arms, and expired before they could convey him to L'Aigle. His body was borne to the convent of St. Sulpice-sur-Risle, which his father had founded near L'Aigle, where he was buried, with great lamentations of his kinsfolk and connections, by Gilbert Bishop of Evreux.

In the month of January following, Gilbert de l'Aigle, eager to avenge his brother, made, in conjunction with William de Warren and William Comte d'Evreux, a desperate assault on the Castle of St. Suzanne; but they were vigorously repulsed by the garrison, William Comte d'Evreux being taken prisoner. In 1091 we find Gilbert in high favour with Robert Court-heuse, who made him Viscount of the Hiemois, and gave him the castle for his residence.

This deeply offended the violent and detestable Robert de Belesme, of whose turbulence and wickedness you have heard so much already, who assembled his troops, and in the first week of January, 1091, besieged the castle for four days, assaulting it with great fury and persistence, notwithstanding a severe frost and heavy fall of snow. Gilbert had but a small

number of retainers in the castle, but they were brave and loyal, and made a stout resistance, hurling spears and stones on the assailants, and precipitating into the ditch those who attempted to scale the walls. Meanwhile his nephew, Gilbert, the young lord of L'Aigle, son of Richer slain on the march to St. Suzanne, hearing of his uncle's position, came to his assistance with eighty men, and getting into the castle by night, supplied the garrison with fresh provisions and arms, and enabled them to continue the defence. Upon this, Robert de Belesme, finding the place too strong for him, in great rage and mortification drew off his troops, and retreated ingloriously to his own territory.

The following year, as the elder Gilbert, brother of Richer, was returning home from a visit to Sainte Scholasse, he halted at Moulins to pay his respects to Duda, daughter of Waleran, Earl of Meulent, and second wife of William de Moulins, lord of that castle, and leaving towards evening unarmed and attended only by his esquires, was seen and pursued by Gerrard Chevreuil and Robert de Ferrers, with some thirteen men-at-arms of the Corbonnais, who endeavoured to take him alive. He spurred his horse to a gallop, but was overtaken and wounded in the side by one of their spears so badly that he died the same day, and on the morrow, which was bissextile-day (29th of February,

1092), he was buried at St. Sulpice, by the side of his parents, amid universal sorrow, Gilbert, Bishop of Evreux, and Serlo, Abbot of St. Evroult, officiating.

Thus we see the three sons of Euguenulf, who himself fell in battle, meet one after the other with a violent death. Roger slain in his youth, Richer in the pride of manhood, and Gilbert while still in the prime of life.

The latter was unmarried, but Richer was the husband of Judith, daughter of Richard, surnamed Goz, Viscount of the Avranchin, and Emma de Conteville, half-sister of the Conqueror, to whom he consequently stood in the position of a nephew.

This lord, says Orderic, "was deservedly regretted by his acquaintance for the many virtues with which he was endowed. In person he was strong, handsome, and active; a faithful observer of the divine laws, courteous and humble with men of religion, prudent and eloquent in worldly affairs, and gentle and liberal in all his conduct."

The issue of Richer and Judith were Gilbert, Euguenulf, Matilda, and, according to Orderic, "several other sons and daughters;" but I have not found traces of them. "They all," he adds, "died" (early, I presume he means) with the exception of Gilbert, "who became the heir to his father's virtues, estates,

and honours." He should have also excepted Matilda, wife of Robert de Mowbray, and who by dispensation of the Pope married, during her husband's incarceration, Nigel de Albini (*vide* p. 30, *ante*), but who certainly was not an exception to the unfortunate destiny attending the majority of her family.

Gilbert, the second of that name, Lord of L'Aigle, the young warrior who so opportunely came to the rescue of his uncle when besieged by Robert de Belesme, married Juliana, daughter of Geoffrey, Count of Mortagne, who, reflecting that the slaying of Gilbert Viscount of the Hiemois, by men who were his vassals, had sown the seeds of infinite mischief to his own territories, endeavoured to accommodate matters with the nephew, and prove that he had no participation in the act, by the offer to him of his daughter's hand, which was accepted, and secured peace between the two families for a period of forty years, an unprecedented circumstance in the early history of Normandy, the barons whereof were in constant hostility one with another.

But even peace could not preserve the line of L'Aigle from calamity. Of the four sons born to Gilbert and Juliana, two were drowned together in the wreck of the "White Ship," 25th November, 1120.

CHAPTER VII.

ROBERT MARMION.
HUGH DE BEAUCHAMP.
WILLIAM DE PERCY.
ROBERT FITZ ERNEIS.
WILLIAM PATRY DE LA LANDE.

ROBERT MARMION.

THIS name, familiarised to the reader's ears by the noble poem of Walter Scott, will conjure up visions of "Norham's castled steep," and the welcome that awaited there the—

> "—Lord of Fontenraye,
> Of Lutterward and Scrivelbaye,
> Of Tamworth Tower and Town;"

a fictitious personage, as "the Wizard of the North" admits, but invested by his genius with such a semblance of truth, that it is difficult not to believe in his existence.

Wace speaks of the companion of the Conqueror as "old *Roger* Marmion;" but no Roger appears in the pedigree before the times of Richard I. It is generally conceived that Roger is either a clerical or

typographical error, and that Robert, to whom William the Conqueror gave "Tamworth Tower and Town" shortly after the Conquest, must be the Marmion who had assisted him in the achievement.

Of that Robert the following story is told by Dugdale, on the faith of an ancient MS. in his day in the possession of John Ferrers, Esq., of Tamworth Castle.

"In the time of the Norman Conqueror, Robert Marmion having, by the gift of that king, the Castle of Tamworth, in the county of Warwick, with the territory adjacent, thence expelled those nuns he found there unto a place called Oldbury, about four miles distant, after which, within the compass of a twelvemonth it is said, making a costly entertainment at Tamworth Castle for some of his friends, amongst which was Sir Walter de Somerville, Lord of Whichover, in the county of Stafford, his sworn brother, it so happened that as he lay in his bed, St. Edith appeared to him as a veiled nun, with a crozier in her hand, and advertized him, that if he did not restore the Abbey of Polesworth, (which lay within the territories of the Castle of Tamworth,) he should have an evil death, and go to ——." Well, it appears St. Edith did not mince her words, but spoke pure Anglo-Saxon, "and that he might be the more sensible of this her admonition,"

continues the narrator, "she smote him on the side with the point of her crozier, and so vanished away! Moreover, that by this stroke being much wounded, he cried out so loud that his friends in the house arose, and finding him extremely tormented with the pain of his wound, advised him to confess himself to a priest, and vow to restore them (the nuns) to their former possession. Furthermore, that having so done, his pain eased, and that in accomplishment of his vow, accompanied by Sir Walter de Somerville and the rest, he forthwith rode to Oldbury, and craving pardon of the nuns for the injury done, brought them back to Polesworth, desiring that himself and his friend Sir Walter de Somerville might be reputed their patrons, and have burial for themselves and their heirs in the Abbey, viz., the Marmions in the chapter-house, and the Somervilles in the cloister." "However," adds worthy Norroy, "some circumstances in this story may seem fabulous" (as they undoubtedly do), "the main substance of it is certainly true, for it expressly appeareth by the very words of his charter, that he gave to Osanna the prioress, for the establishing of the religion of those nuns there, the church of St. Edith of Polesworth, with its appurtenances, so that the Convent of Oldbury (de Aldoberia) should remain in that place, and afterwards

bestowed on them the whole lordship of Polesworth, with its demesnes in Waverton, which grant King Stephen afterwards confirmed."

Robert Marmion had a wife named Milicent, with whose consent he gave the neighbouring town of Butegate to the monks of Bardney, in the county of Lincoln, for the health of the souls of his father and mother (unfortunately not naming them), his own and his wife's soul, and the souls of their heirs.

No particular feats of arms are recorded of old Robert or Roger, as the case may be, either at Senlac or elsewhere; Wace merely says that in the great battle he and Raoul Taisson de Cingueleiz behaved themselves as barons should, and were afterwards richly rewarded.

When he died I have not found, but if deserving the epithet of "old" in 1066, he could scarcely have lived till the reign of Henry I., who granted to his son and heir, Robert, free warren in all his lands in Warwickshire, as Robert his father had, and particularly at Tamworth.

This second Robert possessed the strong Castle of Fontenai, near Caen, called from its ancient lords Fontenai le Mammion, to distinguish it from eight other communes of the same name in Normandy; and it is a question whether the "Sire de Fontenei" men-

tioned by Wace (l. 13,796) was the lord of another Fontenai, or, as it has been suggested, the same person he has previously spoken of as "le viel Rogier Marmion." Several other analogous instances occur in the "Roman de Rou," and I think its author has been too hastily accused of inaccuracy.

The fate of the second Robert Marmion, who married a Maud de Beauchamp, whom I have not yet been able to affiliate, is deserving notice. "Being a great adversary to the Earl of Chester, who had a noble seat at Coventry in the eighth of Stephen, he entered the priory there, which was but a little distance from that Earl's castle, and expelling the monks, fortified it, digging in the fields adjacent divers deep ditches covered over with earth, to the intent that such as made approaches thereto should be entrapped; whereupon it so happened that as he rode out himself to reconnoitre the Earl of Chester's forces that began to draw near, he fell into one of them and broke his thigh, so that a common soldier presently seizing on him, cut off his head."*

The Marmions held the manor of Scrivelsby, in the county of Lincoln, by the service of performing the office of champion at the King's coronation: a co-heir of the family brought Scrivelsby and the championship into

* Dugdale: Baronage, vol. i.

the family of Ludlow, and thence to that of Dymoke, and the office was claimed and served by Sir Henry Dymoke of Scrivelsby, most probably for the last time, at the coronation of his Majesty King George IV., July 19, 1821. But the name of Marmion indicates the possession originally of another office, as its meaning is much the same as Despenser. William Beauchamp of Bedford, connected with the Marmions, acted as grand almoner at the nuptials of King Henry III.

HUGH DE BEAUCHAMP.

The name of this great historical, prolific, and wide-spreading family, of which no less than ten branches are recorded in the Baronage of England, appears in every list of the companions of the Conqueror, but is not mentioned by any of the contemporary writers. Nor do the old lists in which it occurs give the baptismal names of the persons recorded, and we have therefore to search in other quarters for evidence that will enable us to identify the particular member or members of the family who may be fairly presumed to have been present in the battle of Hastings.

In this instance, Domesday supplies us with sufficient information to justify us in admitting the probability of the statement of MM. de Magny and

Delisle, that it was a Hugh de Beauchamp who for his services at the time of the Conquest, received four lordships in Buckinghamshire, and forty-three, or the greatest portion of them, in Bedfordshire, and was the immediate ancestor of the Beauchamps of Bedford.

Of his own parentage I have found no note, but he was most probably descended from the Norman lords of Beauchamp of Avranches, seated between that city and Granville, and a kinsman of the Robert de Beauchamp, Viscount of Arques, in the reign of Henry I., who is first mentioned by Orderic under the year 1171, when by the King's order he seized the castle of Elias de Saint-saens, who had the guardianship of the young heir of Normandy, William Clito, with the object of arresting that prince and consigning him to captivity.

By his wife, unknown, Hugh de Beauchamp is said to have had three sons: Simon, who died without issue; Pagan or Payne, to whom William Rufus gave the whole barony of Bedford with the castle, which was the caput or head of the barony, and Milo, the ancestor of the Beauchamps of Eaton. Thus Dugdale and others; but there is undoubtedly some confusion here which, though noticed by the English translator of Orderic, has not been cleared up by him.

The De Beauchamps who so strongly defended Bedford Castle were, according to Orderic, the sons of Robert de Beauchamp, and not of Hugh, as above stated; and if this Robert be identical with the Viscount of Arques we have just heard of, the whole line of Beauchamp of Bedford is thrown into disorder.

Orderic says that King Stephen, against the advice of his brother Henry, Bishop of Winchester, laid siege to Bedford, but as it was the season of Christmas, and the winter very rainy, after great exertions he had no success. Indeed, *the sons of Robert de Beauchamp* defended the place with great resolution, and until the arrival of the Bishop, the King's brother, rejected all terms of submission to Stephen. Not that they resolved to deny the fealty and service they owed to him as their liege lord, but having heard that the King had given *the daughter of Simon de Beauchamp* to Hugh, surnamed the Poor, with her father's lordships, they feared they should lose their whole inheritance.*

Now here we have also the information that Simon, who is said to have died without issue, left a daughter, for that she could not be the daughter of the second Simon in the pedigree, son of Pagan, first baron of

* Lib. xiii. cap. xxxvi.

Bedford, is clear, as that Simon was living in the eighth of John, 1207.

Dugdale, upon no authority that I can see, calls her the *sister* of the defenders of Bedford, whom he describes as the sons of the second Simon de Beauchamp, steward to King Stephen, which is simply impossible, for the reason just given. We have therefore three different fathers to choose from for the progenitors of the line of Eaton.

Let us now turn to the account of the siege of Bedford by another contemporary writer. The anonymous author of the Acts of King Stephen, says—"The King having held his court during Christmas (at Dunstable) with becoming splendour, despatched messengers to Milo de Beauchamp, who by royal licence had the custody of the Castle of Bedford, with orders that he should hold the castle of Hugh, and do service to him instead of the King. If he readily obeyed this command he should have honour and reward, but if he withstood it in any manner, he was to be assured that it would be his ruin. On receipt of the royal message, Milo replied that he was willing to serve the King as his true knight and to obey his commands, unless he attempted to deprive him of the possessions which belonged to him and his heirs by hereditary right; but if that was the King's intention,

and he endeavoured to execute it by force, he would bear the King's displeasure as best he could; and as for the castle, he would never yield it unless he was driven to the last extremity. Finding how things stood, the King's indignation was roused against Milo, and he raised an army from all parts of England to lay siege to Bedford. Aware of his approach, Milo swept off all the provisions he could lay his hands on, making violent seizures both from the townsmen and the inhabitants of the neighbourhood, with whom before he had been on good terms, as belonging to his lordship. These supplies he stored in the castle, and securely closing the gates he for this time excluded the King's people without any loss on his own side. The King, however, after carefully reconnoitring the fortifications, placed under cover bands of archers at convenient posts, with directions to maintain such a constant discharge of arrows against those who manned the battlements and towers, as should prevent them keeping a good lookout and hold them always in a state of confusion.

"Meanwhile, he exerted all his energies to have engines constructed for filling the trenches and battering the walls. All that skill and ingenuity, labour and expense could compass was effected. Night watches were posted at all the castle gates to prevent any communication by the besieged with their

friends without, or the introduction of provisions or necessaries within the fortress. By day every means were employed to distress and annoy the enemy. But the castle stood on a very high mound, surrounded by a solid and lofty wall, and it had a strong and impregnable keep, containing a numerous garrison of stout and resolute men, so that the expectation of soon taking it proved abortive, and the King having other affairs on his hands which required immediate attention, withdrew, leaving the greater part of his army to carry on the siege, with orders that in case the engines could not effect the reduction of the place, a blockade should be maintained till want and hunger compelled its surrender. After the King's departure the besieging army continued their hostilities, till the garrison, having exhausted their provisions and finding their strength failing, confessed that they could hold the place no longer, and therefore surrendered it to the King according to the laws of war."

Now, in this circumstantial account we hear only of Milo, and there is no hint as to his parentage; but he is spoken of as the holder of Bedford Castle under the King, and as the then head of the family defending his inheritance for himself and his heirs. If he had brothers with him, which Orderic's language implies, they must have been younger sons of Robert the

Viscount and Milo his successor; in which case, how was he related to the nameless daughter of Simon, the wife of Hugh de Meulent, surnamed "the Poor," Earl of Bedford? A word, by the way, of this surname, the explanation of which is clearly given by the author of the "Acts of King Stephen" in a subsequent passage in his history, though no modern writer appears to have paid attention to it.

The reader is told that King Stephen bestowed the earldom of Bedford on Hugh, surnamed the Pauper, and naturally imagines that the said Hugh was raised by the munificence of his sovereign from a state of poverty to rank and affluence. The case, however, is exactly the reverse, for thus says the author just quoted: "Hugh, also surnamed 'The Pauper,' who by royal licence possessed the earldom of Bedford, after the expulsion of Milo de Beauchamp, conducted his affairs with so much negligence, like the careless and effeminate man he was, that, willing or not willing, he gave up the task to Milo, becoming by the righteous judgment of God, from an earl a simple knight, and from that shortly *a penniless man.*" It was not, therefore, Hugh "the Poor," or "the Pauper" who was made the Earl of Bedford, but Hugh de Meulent, third son of Robert Earl of Leicester, by a daughter of the great house of Vermandois, a man of

noble birth, who being created Earl of Bedford, reduced himself by his own folly and effeminacy to so miserable a condition as to acquire the appellation which has been associated with his name for seven centuries, and not unnaturally misled our later annalists and annotators.*

Still we are unable to affiliate Milo, who, whether the son of Hugh or Robert de Beauchamp, must, if the above account can be depended upon, have been in 1137 in possession of the patrimonial estates, including the Castle of Bedford, for which he was commanded thenceforth to do homage to Hugh de Meulent instead of to the King. Pagan, to whom the barony of Bedford was given by William Rufus, must then have been dead; but as he left issue by his wife Rohesia two sons, Simon and Pagan, the eldest of whom confirmed the gifts of his mother, the Countess Rohesia, to the Priory of Chicksand, and to the Abbey of Newenham, founded by his father, and was sheriff of Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire in the reign of Richard I., it is in our present state of information impossible to account for the position of

* The intelligent English translator of Orderic even observes in a note (vol. iv., p. 195), "Nor was it any wonder that the sons of Roger (Robert?) de Beauchamp should oppose the alliance of their cousin-german with a person of *such mean substance* as this Hugh." An altogether gratuitous assumption.

Milo and the language attributed to him. He appears to have been living in the reign of Henry II., when, with consent of Pagan, his heir (not his son, observe), he gave a mill at Bedford to the monks of Bermondsey.

But I must hasten to the line of Beauchamp of Elmley, from which sprang all the most distinguished personages of this proud and potent family. Here again we are met with the same difficulty at starting, for no one has yet been able to show the relationship of Walter, the earliest known of this branch, to Hugh, the companion of the Conqueror, or to Robert the Viscount of Arques. We first hear of him as the husband of Emmeline, daughter of Urso d'Abetot, and sister of Roger, who, for slaying a servant of King Henry I., was banished the realm, and all his estates given to his brother-in-law, this Walter de Beauchamp (then called of Bedford), with the office of Dispensator Regis, which Robert, the brother of Urso, had formerly held; and the shrievalty of Worcestershire to hold as freely as Urso had done, confirming also to him the lands given him by Atheliza, the widow of Urso. Making Elmley Castle in Worcestershire his chief residence, he and his descendants were thenceforth known as Beauchamp of Elmley.

William, the fourth in descent from Walter, married

Isabel, sister and heiress of William de Mauduit, Earl of Warwick, who brought with her the honours and estates of that noble family to swell the fortunes of the already powerful and affluent one of Beauchamp. Henry, the sixth earl in descent from William, was created Duke of Warwick by King Henry VI. in 1444, and by the marriage of his sister Anne with Richard Neville, Earl of Salisbury, he became Earl of Warwick in right of his wife, and is well known to every schoolboy as "the King Maker."

From the same William descended the branches of Alcester and Powick, and the co-heiresses of Richard, last Lord Beauchamp of Powick, carried the representation into the families of Willoughby de Broke and Lygon, ancestors of the present Earls of Warwick and Beauchamp. As in my previous memoir of Nevil, I must express my regret that I am debarred from even briefly describing the interesting events and gallant exploits of the most important members of this family: of Guy Earl of Warwick—not the legendary killer of the Dun Cow, but the valiant leader in the battle of Falkirk, "The Black Dog of Arden," as he was called by Piers Gaveston, an insult which cost that unworthy favourite his life upon the Hill of Blacklow.

Of John, son of that Guy who bore the royal

standard at Cressy, and was one of the founders of the most noble Order of the Garter, or of Richard, an account of whose magnificent array and knightly prowess in the celebrated jousts at Calais would of itself occupy more space than the longest notice I can afford to give to the most important companion of the Conqueror, I cannot venture to speak. I must even apologise to the general reader for the genealogical details which I have been led into by the imperfect and perplexing pedigree of the early Barons of Bedford.

WILLIAM DE PERCY.

The name of Percy, strange to say, does not occur in the Roll of Battle Abbey; for I cannot agree with my old friend Sir Bernard Burke in his discovery of it in Percelay, a form in which I have never found it in any authority. Strange, because in view of the numerous interpolations it contains, one can scarcely imagine the omission of a name so distinguished in Anglo-Norman history. But for those manifest additions the fact of the absence of the name of Percy would go far to establish the genuineness of the Rolls, as no member of that family appears to have fought at Senlac, and William de Percy must be placed in the list of those noble Normans who "came over with the Conqueror" on his return to England in 1067,

amongst whom I have already mentioned Roger de Montgomeri and Hugh d'Avranches.

William de Percy was the sworn brother-in-arms of the latter, and accompanied him to England,* and who on being made Earl of Chester transferred to him the lordship of Whitby, with the extensive domains attached to it in the East Riding of Yorkshire. By what service he obtained the vast possessions held by him at the time of the general survey we have no information, an old manuscript, quoted by Dugdale, simply saying that, "being much beloved by the King," he enjoyed them through his bounty, and it is not till we arrive at the reign of Stephen that we hear of any remarkable actions attributed to his descendants, when his great-great-grandson, William de Percy, distinguished himself by his valour in the famous battle of the Standard.

The name of this ancient and noble family was derived from their great fief of Perci, near Villedieu, in Normandy, and according to tradition they were the descendants of one Mainfred, a Dane, who had preceded Rollo into Neustria. Geoffrey, the son of Mainfred, followed him in the service of Rollo, and was succeeded in rotation by William, Geoffrey, William, and Geoffrey, all born in Normandy, the latter

* Mon. Ang., vol. i., p. 72.

Geoffrey being the father of William de Percy, the subject of this notice, and of Serlo, his brother, the first abbot of Whitby, a monastery founded by William on the site of one called Skinshale, which had been destroyed by Inguar and Hubba.

Upon this abbey William bestowed the towns of Seaxby and Everley; but resumed and regranted them to Ralph de Everley, his esquire, who had been in his service many years.

Abbot Serlo, his brother, feeling injured by this proceeding, made his complaint to William Rufus, with whom he had been on terms of intimacy during the reign of his father, and the King ordered restitution to be made. Serlo, however, was not satisfied with the restoration of the towns, and having no confidence in his brother, determined to quit Whitby and establish himself where he should hold under the King only, and be out of his brother's power. He therefore begged of Rufus six carucates of land in Hakenas and Northfield, and translated thither part of the community of Whitby.

William de Percy married a lady named Emma de Port, "in discharging of his conscience," says our ancient writer, she being "very heire" to the estates given to him by William the Conqueror, and in 1096, having joined the first Crusade in company with

Robert Court-heuse, died at Montjoye, near Jerusalem, the celebrated eminence so named by the Christian Pilgrims, because from there they first caught sight of the sacred city. His body was brought back to England, and buried in the chapter house at Whitby.

This Anglo-Norman race of the Percys became extinct in the male line at the close of the 12th century by the deaths, without issue, of the four sons of his grandson William, when this great inheritance was divided between their two sisters and co-heirs, Maud, wife of William de Mauduit, Earl of Warwick, who died without issue, and Agnes, on whom the whole possessions of the Percys in England devolved, and passed with her hand to Joceleyn de Louvaine, brother of Adeliza, Queen of Henry I., who assumed the name of Percy, retaining the arms of his own family.

From the issue of this marriage descended those great Earls of Northumberland and Worcester, whose deeds and fortunes are interwoven with the most important portions of our history from the reign of Henry III. to that of Charles II.

ROBERT FITZ ERNEIS.

Here we have a companion of the Conqueror who fought and fell at Senlac—one of the very few recorded

to have done so—a most remarkable fact, for surely the names of men who died in the hour of victory were as deserving of commemoration as those of the survivors. That a list of the killed, if not of the wounded, should not have been specially drawn up, and preserved "in memoriam" by the pious monks of Battle, or, at any rate, distinguished by some mark in the Roll, is to me incomprehensible, in days, too, when mortuary Rolls were compiled in nearly every monastic establishment. I cannot help thinking some such document has unfortunately perished, although the silence of Wace and of all other chroniclers respecting the slain at Senlac may be adduced in proof of the little regard paid at that period to the subject. Robert Fitz Erneis, the only Norman mentioned by Wace as having fallen in battle was, as his name imports, the son of Erneis, a collateral descendant of the family of Taisson, by his wife Hawise, sister of Fulk d'Aunou. His death is thus described by Wace: "Robert Fitz Erneis let fall his lance, took his shield and galloped towards the standard, sword in hand, hewing down with its trenchant blade an Englishman who stood before it, and, fighting his way through many others, reached the standard, and endeavoured to cut it down, but the English surrounded it, and killed him with their

guisarmes.* He was found on the spot, when they afterwards sought for him, lying dead at the standard's foot."

He married a lady named, like his mother, Hawise, and had a son called after himself Robert Fitz Erneis, who, in a charter printed in Gallia Christiana (vol. ix. Instrumentum, 334), mentions his father's death: "Eodem vero Patre meo in Anglia occiso."

WILLIAM PATRY DE LA LANDE.

"William Patric de la Lande called aloud for King Harold, saying that if he could see him he would appeal him of perjury. He had seen him at La Lande, and Harold had rested there on his way through, when he was taken to the Duke, then at Avranches, on his road to Brittany. The Duke made him a knight there, and gave him and his companions arms and garments, and sent him against the Bretons. Patric stood armed by the Duke's side, and was much esteemed by him." (*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,723.) Thus far Wace: but the correctness of his account has been questioned by Le Prévost, who considers it contradictory to the evidence of Guillaume de Poitiers, who says the Duke received Harold at Eu, and also of the

* A fearful weapon, combining a pike and a curved blade like that of a reaping hook. Several may be seen in the Tower. No such weapon, however, is depicted in the Bayeux Tapestry.

Bayeux Tapestry, which represents Harold being surrendered to the Duke of Normandy by the Count of Ponthieu in person, observing also that the Duke did not send Harold against the Bretons, but took him with him. This is rather hypercritical, and the whole story of this campaign is one of the most confused in the annals of Normandy, no light being thrown upon it by those of Brittany. Duke William, contemplating the war with Conan, might have been at Avranches, on the borders of Brittany, when the news of Harold's captivity reached him; and the demand for his release despatched thence to Count Wido. William, with his usual rapidity of action, following almost on the heels of his messenger to Eu, on the frontier of Ponthieu, to receive the Saxon prince, or enforce his demand if not promptly complied with.

La Lande Patry is in the arrondissement of Domfront, not far from Avranches, and its lord may have first seen Harold when passing with the Duke to Avranches, on their road to Brittany, instead of on his journey from Beaurain. There is no point of importance involved in this little discrepancy.

The time and place of William's bestowal of knighthood, and giving arms to Harold, is a question of more interest, as the fact represented in the Bayeux Tapestry is distinctly stated by Wace in the passage

I have quoted to have occurred at Avranches previous to the setting out of the expedition; and I am inclined, with all due deference to the contrary opinion of Mr. Freeman, to believe such was the case. Harold, when embarking with hawk and hounds on a pleasurable excursion, was not dreaming of warfare, and was consequently unprovided with armour. It was a positive necessity to present him with helm and hauberk, shield and lance, before he entered the enemy's country, and simultaneously with the bestowal of that Norman knighthood, which, while ostensibly an honour, was one of the toils in which the artful Duke entangled his captive guest.* William Patry de la Lande, one of the Duke's vassals whose fief was nearest to the enemy's frontier, would naturally have been summoned to join his suzerain with whatever power he was bound to bring, and was most probably a witness of the ceremony when, according to the usual formula, Harold must have taken the oaths of chivalry. It is equally probable, as we are assured,

* The position the representation of this incident occupies in the Bayeux Tapestry cannot be used as an argument in favour of the opinion expressed by Mr. Freeman, as chronological order is not invariably observed in that valuable relic. For instance, the funeral of Edward the Confessor precedes his death; and I have also to observe that the figure of Duke William giving arms to Harold appears to have been *squeezed*, if I may so express myself, into that portion of the Tapestry, as though the insertion had been an after-thought—the correction of an omission in the nearest place available.

that Patry was particularly a favourite with his Duke, and that he was also a witness to the oath said to have been taken by Harold somewhere or other, for no two authorities are agreed, by which he bound himself to be "William's Man," and to acknowledge his right to the crown of England on the death of King Edward the Confessor. Who then so likely to accuse Harold of perjury as the Lord of La Lande Patry?

His name may be indicated by "De la Lande" in the Roll of Battle, and another catalogue, but history is silent respecting him or his descendants subsequent to the Conquest, and I have nothing to add to the brief but suggestive notice of him by the Canon of Bayeux.

CHAPTER VIII.

WILLIAM CRISPIN.
AVENEL DE BIARZ.
FULK D'AULNAY.
BERNARD DE ST. VALERI.
ROBERT D'OILEY.
JEAN D'IVRI.

WILLIAM CRISPIN.

It is with great diffidence that I offer any observations whatever on this very mysterious family, from whom so many of the noblest houses in England claim a descent.

Wace enumerates amongst the combatants at Senlac, "William ki l'on dit Crespin," and he has previously mentioned "Cil ki donc gardont Tillieres," who, if not the same personage, must have been one of the family, and is presumed by M. le Prévost to have been Gilbert Crispin, second of that name, brother, according to some genealogists, of William, who was Seigneur de Bec-en-Caux, and whose name

appears in charters of the dates of 1080 and 1082. But if brothers, of whom were they the sons?

The late Mr. Stacey Grimaldi, who considered himself a collateral descendant of the family of Crispin, or Crespin as indifferently written, took great pains to establish the fact, and published in the "Gentleman's Magazine" for October, 1832, a pedigree, founded on his researches, differing from that set forth in the appendix to the works of Lanfranc by D'Achery. His son, the Rev. Alexander B. Grimaldi, of Eastry, Kent, has most kindly intrusted to me what I may call the working papers of his father; but unfortunately they do not throw sufficient light on the point in question. Mr. Stapleton, in his illustrations of the Norman Rolls of the Exchequer, only deals with the later generations, and Le Prévost, in his notes on Wace, simply makes a statement differing from that of Mr. Grimaldi, without citing any evidence in support of it.

According to the latter, Crispinus, Baron of Bec, was the son of Crispina, daughter of Rollo, by Grimaldus, Prince of Monaco. By his wife Heloise of Guynes and Boulogne, Crispinus had five sons, one of whom, Rollo, was the father of Goisfrid de Bec or Marescal, and Toustain Fitz Rou, the standard-bearer at Hastings. Another, named Gilbert Crispin, first succeeded his father as Baron of Bec, and had three

sons, William, Gilbert, and Milo, all present at Hastings. The usual provoking omission of the names and families of the wives of these noble Normans renders it impossible to verify their descent, and deprives genealogy of half its interest. In this particular case it is exceedingly deplorable, as any information respecting the female members of this family would tend to clear up the mystery still involving those of Malet, Lincoln, Roumare, Tankerville, and others, as I have already pointed out.

We may fairly consider, however, that William Crispin I. was the son of Gilbert, Baron of Bec and Castellan of Tillières, who defended that fortress against the French King Henry, and reluctantly surrendered it to him by command of the boy-duke William at the commencement of his reign. According to Père Anselm, who quotes, however, no authority, his mother was Gonnor, sister of Fulk d'Aunou, the companion of the Conqueror. She was also the mother of four other children—Gilbert, who succeeded his father as Baron of Bec; Robert, who died without issue; and two daughters—Emma, married to Pierre de Condé, and Elise, wife of Robert Malet.

According to the same genealogist, William Crispin who fought at Senlac married, previous to 1077,

Eva, the daughter of Simon de Montfort l'Aumary, by whom he had William Crispin II., the doughty warrior at the battle of Bremule, and Gilbert, who became a monk in the Abbey of Bec, and eventually Abbot of Westminster.

William Crispin I., the subject of this memoir, we have previously heard of as one of the victorious leaders in the murderous battle of Mortemer, 1054. He must have been a very young man at that time, and probably it was the first combat of consequence he had ever been engaged in. He was living in 1082, when he witnessed the foundation charters of the Conqueror to the Abbeys of St. Stephen and the Holy Trinity, at Caen, and the confirmation of the privileges of the Abbey of Fontenville, in the same year, at the council held at Oistel, near Rouen. No particular exploit is recorded of him at Senlac, nor do we hear of his being employed in any military service either in England or Normandy after the Conquest. He was probably deceased before 1085, as his name does not appear in Domesday, Milo Crispin, a brother of his, according to Mr. Grimaldi, but not named by Père Anselm, being at the time of the survey in possession of certain estates, some of which may have been granted previously to William.

His brother Gilbert was probably, as already men-

tioned, the personage "who held Tillières" in 1066, and followed his feudal lord to England. He and Henry de Ferrers charged the English together, each having brought a large company into the field. All who opposed them were either killed or captured. "The earth trembled beneath them" (*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,503). From him descended the Seigneurs de Tillières, one of whom, Gilbert, presumably his son and heir, was the second husband of Eleanore de Vitré, afterwards wife of William Fitz Patrick, first Earl of Salisbury.

Milo, the tenant in Domesday, is not attempted to be affiliated by Dugdale, and is altogether ignored by Anselm. I do not find him in any way alluded to by Wace as having been in the battle, and Mr. Grimaldi alone makes him a brother of William and Gilbert. Whoever he might be, he was a very substantial personage, possessing no less than eighty-eight lordships in England at the time of the survey, and, by marriage with Maud, daughter of Robert d'Oiley, becoming Lord of Wallingford, in Berkshire, the castle whereof he made his principal seat.

But I must now return to the sisters of William and Gilbert, one of whom, called by Anselm *Elise*, he marries to Robert Malet. This is important, if true, for in that case she may be the sister of William

Crispin, otherwise named Hesilia (Elisia?), mother, according to the pedigree in D'Achery, of the William Malet who fought at Senlac, and gave Conteville (however he came by it) to the Abbey of Bec.

I have pointed out the curious association of the names of Herleve, mother of the Conqueror, and Gilbert Crispin. Is it probable that she survived Herluin, and married secondly Gilbert, Baron of Bec-Crispin and Castellan of Tillières, and that Conteville passed in this way by his daughter, Hesilia or Elisia, to her son William Malet, who gives it, you observe, to the Abbey of Bec, and not to Gerstein, founded by Herluin?

We have no dates or evidence whatever of the marriage of Gilbert with Gonnor, or of their decease, and where there is so much confusion and incertitude a little speculation is perhaps allowable when provoked by evidence hitherto apparently disregarded. There is a charter of foundation of the priory of Châteauceaux, printed by Morice in his "Histoire de Bretagne," Preuves, tom. i., pp. 384-5, which contains some interesting information respecting a branch of the Crispin family to be identified. In English it would run thus: I, Gaufridus (Geoffrey or Godfrey) Crispin, Lord of Châteauceaux, for my salvation and the redemption of the soul of my beloved wife Margaret, and with the assent and authority of my

brothers, Herluin, Onderic, Joscelin, and Ralph, &c.; and the gift is witnessed by Theobald, his eldest son, the lady Girbergia, his mother, and Simon Crispin, his brother; a William Crispin being also named in the charter. Le Prévost, in his notes to Wace, strenuously opposes the theory of Mr. Grimaldi, who derives Toustain Fitz Rou and Geoffrey de Bec from the same stock as the Crispins. "William Crispin," he says, "first of the name, Lord of Bec-Crispin, a celebrated barony which has given its name to the two communes of Notre Dame and of St. Martin du Bec-Crispin, near Montvilliers. This family has nothing in common with Toustain, standard-bearer to the Duke at Hastings, and originally of Bec-aux-Cauchois;" the former being in the arrondissement of Havre, and the latter in that of Yveto.

This is very authoritative, but requires some documentary evidence for its support. In the charter to Châteauceaux we find a Gaufridus Crispin, who may be the brother of Toustain, though his name is not mentioned; in which case Girbergia would be the wanting wife of Rollo. But unfortunately she is not named by Mr. Grimaldi, and Gaufridus does not name his father, so that we are still unable to decide that controversy.

Toustain Fitz Rou is said to have been the grand-

father of Walkelin Malet. I am weary of saying, "is said," but as that would take us two generations below the Conquest, I need not pursue that line or "bestow my tediousness" any further on the general reader.

I shall therefore conclude my notice of the Crispins by observing, that from Geoffrey de Bec, or Maresc al of Domesday, Mr. Grimaldi derives the present family of Fitzwilliam.

AVENEL DE BIARZ.

The Seigneur de Biarz is twice mentioned by Wace in his "Roman de Rou." First in company with Richard d'Avranches—

"D'Avranchin i fu Richarz
Ensemble od li cil de Biarz" (l. 13,600-1).

and subsequently thus—

"Des Biarz i fu Avenals" (l. 13,632).

Which might or might not be the same person, or simply that there was more than one of that family in the Duke's army. "There were the Avenels of the Biarz." Les Biards being a bourg on the banks of the Selune, canton of Isigny, arrondissement of Mortain.

The companion of the Conqueror is assumed by Le Prévost to have been William Avenel, Seigneur des Biards, who was seneschal of Robert Comte de

Mortain, the Duke's half-brother, and would therefore probably follow his lord to the wars. There is no reason, however, that one or more of his brothers (he appears to have had five) should not have accompanied him.

The name of Avenel does not occur in either of the Rolls of Battle Abbey, but it is included in Brompton's List, and the rhyming one of Leland. A sub-tenant of that name occurs also in Domesday, holding half a hide of land in the hundred of Cendovre, under Roger de Montgomeri, Earl of Shrewsbury; but we trace no grants from the Conqueror to any one of the family in reward of their services at Senlac, a circumstance which excites the surprise of the authors of "Les Recherches," to whom we are indebted for many particulars of the early lords of the Biards or Es-Biards.

According to Vincent de Beauvais, an historian of the thirteenth century, one Harold Avenel was the first of the family who settled in Normandy, whither he had accompanied Rolf, of whom he was a kinsman as well as of the Paynels, the Taissons, the Giffards, and others of Scandinavian origin, and his statement, though not always to be relied upon, is in this instance fairly supported by documentary evidence. In a charter by Hugues, the son of John de Roceto,

A.D. 1035, granting to the Abbey of Marmoutiers the Church of St. Martin de Belesme, the gift is declared to be made with the consent of Odo, brother of Henry I. King of France, of Geoffrey Count of Anjou, Ivo Bishop of Séez, and of the grantor's kinsman, Hervé de Braviard (Biuard, or Biard). In another charter, dated 1067, having reference to a dispute respecting the above donation, the name recurs of Hervé, the kinsman of Hugues de Roceto, in conjunction with that of a Sigemberg des-Biarz, apparently the son of Hervé, who also seems to have been the father of Ormellinus, surnamed Avenellus, who, with the consent of his wife Avitia, in 1060 concedes a third of his rights on the Church of St. Martin de Say.* Sigemberg des Biarz dying without male issue, we find the sons of his brother Osmellinus joining the name of Biarz to that of Avenel, borne by their father.

We thus arrive at the epoch of the Conquest, when it appears that Sigemberg des Biarz was still living, and possibly Ormellinus his brother also, as he and his wife Avitia were benefactors to St. Martin de Say in 1060. Sigemberg if not too old might therefore be in the battle, and be the "Seigneur" de Biarz of Wace, distinguished from the "Avenels," his nephews,

* Gall. Christ. Instr., col. 153.

none of whom could have succeeded to the lordship of Des Biards before 1067.

These Avenels, sons of Ormellinus and Avitia were, as I have already intimated, six in number. William, the seneschal, selected by Le Prévost as the combatant at Senlac; Ranulf, living in 1081; Joel, Abbot of La Couture in 1081; Walter, living in 1081, and Hervé and Traslen, or Gradin, both living in 1106.

William Avenel des Biarz in 1082, in conjunction with his brother, gave the Church of Vezens and the Priory of Les Biarz to the Abbey of La Couture in the diocese of Mans, of which his brother Joel was the fifth abbot; and Ranulf, his other brother, caused the gift to be confirmed by his son and heir, Rainold Avenel, at that date in his childhood. The same William Avenel also witnesses the charter of Robert, Comte de Mortain, by which he founds a prebend in the college of St. Evroult for the priory of Mortain in 1088. His wife is unknown, but his sons by her were William, second of that name, Richard, Robert, and Hugh Avenel. From William II. descended the Avenels of France, the elder branch of which family terminated in the male line with the death of his great-grandson in the fourteenth century, whose daughter Guillenine brought the whole of the Barony des Biards to the house of Le Sotherel.

How the Avenel of Domesday was connected with William the Seneschal, and from which of his brothers the English branch descended, remains yet undecided; but an Avenel of Haddon witnessed the foundation charter of the Priory of Linton in Nottinghamshire by William Peverel in the reign of Henry I., in company with Henry de Ferrers, Ralph Ansleyn, and others.

The same Avenel by his own charter granted to that priory two manors which formed part of his domain of Haddon. Another charter by William Peverel in the register of Lenton is witnessed by a William Avenel, and a Robert Avenel subscribes the foundation charter of the Abbey of St. James at Welbeck; and I am inclined to believe that Ranulf, one of the younger brothers of William the Seneschal, was the progenitor of the English Avenels.

Vincent has transcribed a charter of William, the son of William Avenel, wherein he names Richard de Vernon and Simon Basset as the husbands of his two daughters and heirs, with whom they had lands in Haddon and Welbeck, and we obtain the name of the daughter who married Richard de Vernon from a charter of their son William de Vernon, who calls his mother Avicia Avenel, a family name which we can trace from the wife of Ormellinus in the eleventh

century to the Avicia Avenel who married John Rollesly in the fourteenth.

By the above charter we see how Haddon passed from the Avenels to the Vernons. The romantic but authentic story of the flight of the fair Dorothy, daughter and co-heir of Sir George Vernon, with Sir John Manners, from Haddon Hall, has been told too often to call for repetition here, and is only referred to in illustration of the Norman descent of the Dukes of Rutland from Ormellinus, "qui cognominhabitus Avenellus," through the baronial house of Vernon, a scion of which also demands our notice, under the name of

FULK D'AULNAY.

The Sire "d'Alnei" mentioned by Wace (*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,775) receives but little attention from either the French or the English commentators of the Norman poet, and they have made no attempt to identify him. There are several communes of that name in Normandy, one of which, Aulnay l'Abbaye, near Caen, belonged in the twelfth century to the family of Say, a member of which was present at Senlac; Monsieur de Gerville mentions also a Laulne near Lessay, latinised de Alno, but I find no conclusive evidence as to the fief or locality from which the Sire d'Alnei of Wace derived his appellation.

The continuator of Guillaume de Jumiéges, however, enlightens us as to his parentage; a point of more importance. As I have already stated, page 47 of this volume, he tells us that Fulk de Aneio (de Alneto, de Ancto, d'Anet, for it is spelt all manner of ways) was the son of Osmund de Centumville (*i.e.* Cotenville) by a niece of the Duchess Gonnor or Gunnora, and, according to the same authority, uncle of a Baldwin de Redvers. Osmundo de Centumville was Vicomte de Vernon, and a Hugh de Redvers, also called Hugh de Vernon, another uncle of the same Baldwin, made grants to Brumore in 1089. That members of the latter family were indifferently called De Rivieres and De Vernon many proofs could be adduced, showing that they were of the same stock, assuming the names of their own fiefs for distinction, as in the instance of the sons of Baudry le Teuton, to the great confusion of the genealogist and mystification of the readers of history.

That Vernon was the general name of the descendants of Osmund, can, I think, be scarcely doubted. William de Vernon possessed the town and Castle of Vernon in 1052, a fief which had been held by Guy of Burgundy, on whom, in his youth, Duke William had bestowed it together with Brionne, but who lost both by his defeat at Val-ès-Dunes in 1047. Brionne, we see,

was given to Baldwin de Meules on the marriage of William and Matilda, and Vernon probably bestowed it on Osmund de Centumville when he became the husband of a niece of the fortunate Gonnor, Duchess of Normandy. William, probably his son, who was Sire de Vernon in 1052, had two sons, Walter and Richard de Vernon, both of whom are stated to have followed Duke William to England.* That the name of Vernon appears in the Roll of Battle, in the list printed by Duchesne, and the rhyming one of Leland, would be no corroboration of that statement; but there is evidence enough that Richard de Vernon was one of the barons created by Hugh d'Avranches, Earl of Chester, by the title of Shipbroke, and a holder of large estates at the time of the general survey. There is consequently proof that, if not actually in the invading army, he was a distinguished Norman at that period, and is probably the Sire de Neahou whom Wace says was in the battle, as that fief, Neel's Hou or Holm, in the arrondissement of Valognes, passed from the Vicomtes de St.-Sauveur to that of Reviers-Vernon, and in the red book of the Exchequer a Richard de Vernon is returned as holding the honour of Nehou by the service of ten knights, and having the custody of the Castle of Vernon.

* The French catalogues add "*Huard*" de Vernon, a name hitherto unknown.

I will not pretend to decide upon the exact relationship of Fulk d'Aulnay to William de Vernon, but that they were very near connections, if not brothers, I think cannot be well disputed.

From a similarity of names, Fulk d'Aulnay has been confounded constantly with Fulk d'Aunou, of whom I have already discoursed (p. 132, *ante*). Even M. le Prévost has been partially misled by it.

Beyond his presence in the battle, I have no information to give. Genealogy and history are both silent about him as far as I know. The name of De Alneto is of frequent occurrence in charters of the subsequent century. A Berenger d'Alneto subscribes the foundation charter of the Abbey of Aumale in 1115. Hubert de Alneto witnesses two charters of Henry I., and Roger de Alneto appears to be a relation of Gundred de Gournay, wife of Nigel de Albini; but no link is discoverable between either of these and Fulk. Was he amongst the hundreds of unrecorded slain? Did he fall in the fight for the standard, or was he slaughtered in the slough of the Malefosse? A Simon d'Aneti or de Aneio, recorded in the red book aforesaid, is asserted by the authors of the "Recherches sur le Domesday" to be the recognized descendant of "Foulques d'Anet," but they have not favoured us with the materials for such recognition.

I have said so much about the Vernons in this notice of one of the family that I shall not appropriate a separate article to them, as I could only repeat my suggestion, that if a De Vernon was present at Senlac, he was probably alluded to by Wace as the Sire de Nehou, a portion of which fief was certainly held by Richard de Vernon when Wace wrote, and might have been held by him, under the Viscount of Saint-Sauveur, by military service at the time of the invasion, if indeed Nehou was restored to Neel after its forfeiture in 1047, at which period it was probably given to Baldwin de Redvers who has been so frequently confounded with Baldwin de Meules, as I have instanced in my memoir of him (page 40, *ante*).

BERNARD DE ST. VALERI.

Orderic has supplied us with plenty of material for a memoir of the family of St. Valeri, indifferently written Waleri and Galeri, so many of which were benefactors to his beloved Abbey of Ouchè, otherwise St. Evroult, and, as the fleet of Duke William sailed from the port of St. Valery-sur-Somme, the bourg from which they took their name, it would be strange indeed if a "Sire de St. Galeri" had not been found in Wace's catalogue of the companions of the Conqueror.

They did not, however, hold the fief of St. Valeri in their own right, but as hereditary advocates of the abbey, founded there by Lothaire in 613, in which the lordship was vested. To the devotion of the Duke and his barons to its patron saint, the Merovingian Walleric, and the solemn procession of the abbot and monks bearing the shrine which contained his holy relics, was attributed the favourable change of the wind for which William had so long waited.

The Sires of St. Valeri were also connected by marriage with the ducal family, and could claim cousinship by blood with the Conqueror. Gilbert, the Advocate of St. Valeri, married Papia, daughter of Richard II. Duke of Normandy, by his wife, "more Danico," of that name. She bore to him two sons, Bernard and Richard. Of Richard, I shall speak hereafter. It is with his elder brother that we have first to deal, as he has been unhesitatingly named by M. le Prévost as the "Sire de Galeri" of the Norman poet, though upon what authority I have not been able to discover. Certainly not upon that of Orderic, who, provokingly enough, while most liberal in his information respecting Richard and his descendants, tells us nothing about Bernard except that he was the father of Walter de St. Valery, who was probably the Walter of Domesday, possessing at the time of its compilation,

amongst other estates, the extensive manor of Isleworth, in the county of Middlesex, but whether as the heir of his father, on whom they might have been bestowed by the Conqueror, or acquired by himself, either as a reward for service rendered to his sovereign or through some fortunate marriage, we are left to conjecture.

If Bernard was really the companion of the Conqueror at Hastings and Senlac, the former solution of the question is most reasonable, and the possession of the domains by his son Walter has probably been the chief ground for Le Prévost's statement, which Mr. Taylor copies without observation, as well as for that of MM. de Magny and Delisle. Still it is rather extraordinary that the historian of the family should record the military services, the marriages and issue of Richard and his sons, and make no mention of so interesting a fact as the presence of the elder brother Bernard in the expedition which sailed from his own port, and the famous victory in which it resulted.

We must therefore content ourselves perforce with the assurance of Wace, that the Lord of St. Valeri, and those he rode with, demeaned themselves like brave men, and sorely handled all whom their weapons could reach. We hear nothing of him after the Conquest, and he was probably dead when Walter de

St. Valery was found seized of the manor of Isleworth. The latter was living in 1097, when, with his son Bernard, he was in the Holy Land, and fought under the banners of Bohemond in the great battle of Dorylæum.

But Walter de St. Valery was not the only one of the name who held lands in England at the time of the survey.

A Ranulf de St. *Walerie* was Lord of Randely, Stamtone, Refan, Stratone, Burgrede, and Scotome, in Lincolnshire, but how related to Walter does not appear. "What came of him or his posterity," says Dugdale, "if he had any, I know not, for those in the succeeding ages had not any lands in that county." "Those" being the issue of Reginald, son of Guy de St. Valerie, who held Hazeldine, in Gloucestershire, of which he was deprived by King Stephen, being a partizan of Henry Fitz Empress, but recovered it again on the accession of the latter, and who was one of the persons sent by him with letters to the King of France, requesting him not to give any reception or protection to the fugitive Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket.

That this Reginald was a lineal descendant of Bernard and Walter is obvious from the fact that, on the death of his grandson Thomas, in 1219 (3 Henry III.),

all his hereditary estates passed with Annora, sole child of Thomas, to her first husband, Robert Comte de Dreux, to whom at the same time she brought the manor of Isleworth, which Walter held in the reign of the Conqueror, and of which the Comte de Dreux was found seized in right of his wife in 1220.*

Let us, however, before leaving this subject, hear what Orderic has to say respecting Richard de St. Valery and his descendants. This second son of Gilbert and Papia was "long employed in the military service of his uncle, Richard Duke of Normandy, from whom he received in marriage Ada, widow of the elder Herlcuin de Heugleville, with all her inheritance." Hence it appears he assumed, according to custom, the name of Heugleville, and built a town at a place formerly called Isnelville, on the river Sie, naming it from the hill which rose above it covered with beech trees, Aufay (Alfagium), thus acquiring a third appellation as the Lord of Aufay. He was distinguished for his military abilities and his great liberality—a formidable foe and a faithful friend. During the minority of Duke William, when William of Arques revolted against him, and he was deserted by nearly all the Lords of Talou, Richard alone held his castle near the

* Annora married secondly Henry de Sullie, but had no issue by either husband. Orderic makes no mention of Ranulf, Guy, or Reginald in his account of the family.

Church of St. Aubin against the rebels, and exerted himself to defend the loyal inhabitants of the country from the inroads of the garrison of Arques.

Now this Richard de Heugleville, Lord of Aufay, had a son named, as usual after his grandfather, Gilbert, who married Beatrice, daughter of Christian de Valenciennes, "an illustrious captain." This lady, Orderic tells us, was a cousin of Queen Matilda, and bore to her husband two sons and one daughter. Gilbert d'Aufay, as he was called from his patrimonial estates, was also, by his grandmother Papia, a kinsman of Duke William, and the same author affirms that "he fought by the Duke's side at the head of his vassals *in all the principal actions* during the English War."

That he included the most important of all is, I think, evident from the passage which follows:—"*But when William became King*, and peace was established, Gilbert returned to Normandy, notwithstanding William offered him ample domains in England, for with innate honesty of character he refused to participate in the fruits of rapine. Content with his patrimonial estates, he declined those of others, and piously devoted his son Hugh to a monastic life under Abbot Mainer, in the Abbey of St. Evroult."

The name of St. Valery is only to be found in Brompton and the modern lists, and that of Aufay no-

where. In deference to M. le Prévost, who may have had grounds for his opinion which he has omitted to cite, I have headed this memoir with the name of Bernard as the "Sire de St. Galeri" mentioned by Wace; but it is quite possible that the Lord of Aufay may have been designated by his original patronymic, and he is the only member of the family of St. Valery who appears indubitably to have been a companion of the Conqueror.

ROBERT D'OILEY.

There may be, it seems, a question whether by "d'Oillie" (*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,659) the author means one of the many "Ouillies" to be found in the arrondissement of Falaise, or Ailly, near Centibœuf; but whatever doubt there may be respecting the locality from which this valiant Norman derived his name, there is none as to his having been at Senlac, and rewarded for his services there with the baronies of Oxford and St. Waleries in England. He is simply mentioned as "cil d'Oillie" by Wace amongst some dozen of doughty knights, to whom no particular feat of arms is accorded; and unless we are to consider "Duylly" in Leland's alliterative list is intended for it, the name occurs in no catalogue of those who came in with the Conqueror—one of the many proofs of the little dependence that can be placed on any.

Robert d'Oiley built the Castle of Oxford, and the collegiate church of St. John within the walls. He was also one of the witnesses to the foundation charter of the Abbey of Selby by King William, and at the time of the general survey possessed four lordships in Berkshire, fourteen in Herefordshire, seven in Buckinghamshire, three in Gloucestershire, and three in Northamptonshire, one in Bedfordshire, one in Warwickshire, and twenty-eight in Oxfordshire, in all sixty-one manors; besides forty-two habitable houses in Oxford, and eight which then lay waste, with thirty acres of meadow land adjoining the wall, and a mill valued at ten shillings per annum of the money of that time. Being likewise Constable of Oxford, he had the full sway of the whole county, and was so powerful a baron that no one durst oppose him.

With the King's consent he took possession of a large meadow near the Castle of Oxford which belonged to the monks of Abingdon, who, being sorely aggrieved by this act, came in a body before the altar of our Lady, and prostrating themselves, prayed with tears to God that He would avenge the injury. Whereupon, says Dugdale, it shortly after happened that D'Oiley fell into a grievous sickness, but continued impenitent until one night he dreamed that he was in a royal palace, where, amongst many nobles standing

about it, was a glorious throne, on which sat a beautiful person habited like a woman, and before her knelt two monks of Abingdon whom he knew, and who, when they saw him enter the palace, said with deep sighs to the Lady, "Behold this is he who usurpeth the inheritance of thy church, having taken away that meadow from us for which we make this complaint." The Lady, much moved, commanded that he should be thrust out of doors and taken to that meadow, there to be tormented. Two young men who stood near immediately seized and led him to the meadow, where they made him sit down, and he was forthwith surrounded by divers ugly children with loads of hay upon their shoulders, who laughingly said to each other, "Here is our friend, let us play with him!" Upon which, setting fire to the hay, they smoked and burned him till in his anguish he called out aloud, "O blessed Lady! have pity upon me, for I am dying!" His wife, much alarmed, exclaimed, "Awake, sir, for you are much troubled in your sleep," and being thus aroused, he answered, "Yes, truly, for I was amongst devils!" "The Lord preserve thee from all harm!" ejaculated his pious and affectionate helpmate, and on hearing his dream, consoled him with the text, "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth."

At her instance, to quiet his conscience, he shortly afterwards repaired to Abingdon, and there, before the altar, in presence of Abbot Reginald and the whole convent, as well as of many personal friends, he gave to the community the lordship of Cadmerton, value ten pounds per annum, solemnly protesting that he would never meddle more with any of their possessions. He also presented them with more than a hundred pounds in money towards the reconstruction of their monastery, in atonement for the wrong he had done them. Moreover, he amended his ways for the rest of his life, repairing divers churches both within and without the walls of Oxford, becoming very charitable to the poor, and amongst other good works building the great bridge there.

I have told this silly story (omitting some little coarseness), as I have told others of the same nature in the course of this work, in illustration of the childish superstition by which men of the most undaunted courage—fierce, proud and powerful men—were weak enough to be enslaved. Some of these tales were doubtless subsequent inventions by the monks themselves, while others are veritable descriptions of "pious frauds" practised by them on the sick or the dying, for the purpose of augmenting their funds or increasing their influence. At the same time

it is singular to observe the simple good faith with which truly religious and honest writers, such as Orderic, testify to the veracity of the most preposterous narrations on the grounds of their having heard them from the very lips of the persons who have been favoured with such miraculous manifestations.

However unworthy of credit they may generally be, there are few that do not afford us peeps into past manners and customs, pictures of the inner life of our ancestors, and incidental information on a variety of subjects formerly considered beneath the notice of the historian, but of which the value has within the last fifty years been discovered and acknowledged by the most eminent authors of France, England, and Germany. One of the results recorded by the monks of Abingdon of the dream of Robert d'Oiley—if ever he had such a dream—was the building of the first great bridge at Oxford; the earliest information we possess upon the subject, and which may be depended upon, whatever doubt may be entertained of the veracity of the vision.

The exemplary wife of Robert d'Oiley was the daughter and apparently heir of Wygod of Wallingford, "a person of great note in that age," by whom he had an only daughter named Maud, the wife first of Milo Crispin, and secondly of Brien Fitz Count, to

whom she brought the whole barony of Wallingford, but having no issue, both she and Brien betook themselves to a religious life, whereupon King Henry I. seized Wallingford and appropriated it to his own uses.

Robert d'Oiley leaving no male issue was succeeded by his brother Nigel, whose son and successor, Robert, married the beautiful Edith Forne, mistress of Henry I., and by that king mother of Robert, Earl of Gloucester. There is a little bit of mediæval gossip about this lady, which professes to account for the foundation of the Abbey of Oseney, near Oxford. The fair but frail Edith, having become the lawful wife of the said Robert d'Oiley, was in the frequent habit of strolling down from the castle to the banks of the Isis. The pleasure she derived from this innocent and healthful recreation was, however, considerably interfered with by the conduct of a colony of "chatterpies," who had established themselves in a clump of trees by the side of the river, and invariably on her appearance commenced a most impertinent clamour, which it was impossible to mistake for flattery. Humiliated as well as irritated by this almost daily insult, she sent for a canon of St. Fridiswides in Oxford, named Randolph, a person of virtuous life, and her own confessor, and requested his advice on the matter. Of

course he suggested that the only mode of escaping the malicious mockery of the magpies was to clear away the trees and build some religious house upon the spot, which she immediately entreated her husband to do, who kindly consented, and thereupon erected and founded the Abbey of Oseney for black canons of the order of St. Augustin, and, with the consent of his two sons, Henry and Gilbert, richly endowed it with lands and other property, constituting Randolph (no doubt to his great surprise) the first prior.

Margery, the elder of Robert's two granddaughters, co-heirs of their brother Henry, the last male of the D'Oileys, married Henry de Beaumont, Earl of Warwick, and has generally been accredited as the mother of his heir, Thomas Earl of Warwick, and consequently ancestress of the Marshals and De Plessites. By a writ of "Novel disseisin," 11th of Henry III., I am inclined to believe Thomas was the son of Philippa, the second wife of Henry de Beaumont, who was daughter of *Thomas*, Lord Basset of Heddington, and has been hitherto said to have died without issue. Many erroneous descents have been recorded in these early pedigrees through the neglect of accurately ascertaining, in cases where a man has married two or more wives, which lady was the mother of his heir. In the instance of Adeliza, sister of the Con-

queror, we have seen her issue by each husband most perplexingly confounded.

JEAN D'IVRI.

I shall conclude this chapter with a few lines containing all I have hitherto discovered respecting this personage, who is only known as the sworn brother-in-arms of Robert d'Oiley, and who appears to be equally entitled with him to claim companionship with the Conqueror, yet I do not find his name in any roll or catalogue, nor can I detect him amongst the many unidentified leaders mentioned by Wace. That he is not a myth, however, is clear from the fact of his having received from Robert d'Oiley a large share of the spoil, and specially the honor of St. Waleries; but whether he married or left issue does not appear. His patronymic would point to a descent from Ralph, Comte d'Ivri, or Yvery (latinized Ibreio and Iberico), half-brother of Richard I., being the son of Sprote, mistress of William Longsword, Duke of Normandy, by Asperleng, the wealthy Miller of Vaudreuil, whom she married after the death of the Duke.

Aubrée or Alberade, wife of Count Ralph, built the famous Castle of Ivri. The architect was Lanfred, whose reputation transcended that of all the masters

of his craft at that period. Having, with vast labour and expense, constructed a fortress unequalled in Normandy, the bright idea occurred to the lady that it should so remain as far as Lanfred was concerned. In order, therefore, that his skill should not be exercised by an endeavour to surpass himself for the benefit of some other, perhaps hostile employer, she prudently had his head cut off as soon as his work was completed. The lady eventually suffered the same fate at the hands of Count Ralph, her husband, who, though he seems to have connived at her murder of the architect, considered her attempt to expel him from his own castle was an offence amounting to no less than treason, and made her pay the penalty of such high crime and misdemeanour.

She had borne to him two sons, Hugh, Bishop of Bayeux, and John, Bishop of Avranches and afterwards Archbishop of Rouen. The name of John indicates some family connection between the Archbishop and the friend of Robert d'Oiley. There was also a Roger d'Ivri, who was cupbearer to King William the Conqueror, and married Adeline, one of the daughters of Hugh de Grentmesnil, the founder of the Abbey of Ivri in 1071, and was probably the brother of John I. The father of Roger was Waleran d'Ivri, who held one knight's fee in the bailiwick of

Tenchebrai, in Normandy, by service of cupbearer to the Duke, so that the office appears to have been hereditary in the family; also eight and a half knights' fees in the town and castle of Ivri. They were not lords of Ivri, but apparently hereditary castellans of the fortress until the close of the eleventh century.

According to tradition, Count Ralph had Ivri given to him by Duke Richard, his uterine brother, in consequence of his slaying a monstrous bear when they were out hunting together. The fief appears to have passed from Ralph to Fitz Osbern, and in the second year of the reign of Rufus was in the possession of William de Breteuil.

Ascelin Goel de Percival, son of Robert d'Ivri, Lord of Breval, took the Castle of Ivri by surprise and delivered it to Robert Court-heuse. De Breteuil, unwilling to lose it, redeemed it from the Duke for fifteen hundred livres. Having recovered his castle, to punish Goel he deprived him of the hereditary right to its custody, and of everything he held in his lordship. The fierce Lord of Breval avenged himself by laying waste the whole neighbourhood. Aumari de Montfort, called Le Fort, having fallen in an inroad he was making on the lands of William de Breteuil, Richard, his brother, devoted himself to avenge his death, and joining his forces with those of Ascelin Goel, they

attacked and defeated De Breteuil in a pitched battle, taking him prisoner, and consigning him to a noisome dungeon, in which he lingered until Richard de Montfort relenting, succeeded, with the assistance of Hugh de Montgomeri, Earl of Shrewsbury, Gervase de Neuchatel, and many others, in making peace between Ascelin Goel and his feudal lord and prisoner. According to the terms of the treaty concluded at Breval, William de Breteuil gave his illegitimate daughter Isabel in marriage to Goel, and ransomed himself at the expense of a thousand livres of Dreux, besides horses, arms, and other property. With great sorrow he added also the impregnable Castle of Ivri. "The infamous freebooter," as Orderic calls Goel, "thus enriched, grew intolerably insolent, and enclosed his castle,* which was indeed a very den of thieves, with deep ditches and stout palisades, passing his life there in continued rapine and bloodshed. He had seven sons by his wife Isabel, who, as they grew in years, increased in wickedness, so that the cries of the widow and the destitute followed their evil deeds." Of these seven very bad men only three are known, Robert, lord of Ivri, Roger le Begue, and William Louvel (Lupellus, the little Wolf), ancestors of the Lovels of

* Breval, I presume, for Ivri was in no need of further defences. It was, as we have seen, a model fortress.

Tichmarsh, the Lords Lovel of Kary, and the Percivals, Earls of Egmont. The introduction, therefore, of the name of Lovel in the Roll of Battle Abbey, Brompton's List, and the second list in Leland is completely unjustifiable, as William the son of Ascelin Goel, on whom it was first bestowed, could not have been born for at least thirty years after the Conquest. The same observation applies to that of Percival, unless a Sire de Percival can be found earlier than Ascelin Goel.

CHAPTER IX.

RAOUL DE FOUGERES.
ERRAND DE HARCOURT.
WILLIAM PAINEL.
WALTER D'AINCOURT.
SAMSON D'ANSNEVILLE.
HAMO DE CRÈVECŒUR.
PICOT DE SAY.

RAOUL DE FOUGERES.

"HE of Felgieres," says Wace, "also won great renown with many very brave men he brought from Brittany." The absence of the baptismal name, as in so many other instances, is a serious obstacle to satisfactory identification.

A Ralph and a William de Fougeres (de Filgeriis, as it is latinized) are found tenants in Domesday, but we have no evidence to show that the Ralph therein returned was the Raoul presumed to have been "Cil de Felgieres," as Wace writes it, alluded to in the above passage ("Rom. de Rou," l. 13,496). Meen or Main II. was Baron of Fougeres in Brittany at the time of the Conquest, and not too old to have been himself in the expedition, being about the age of the Conqueror, having succeeded his father

Alfred I. in 1048, and surviving the invasion of England some sixteen or seventeen years. By his wife Adelaide he had three sons—Juthael, Eudes or Odo, and Raoul. The two former died in his lifetime without issue, and he was therefore succeeded by his younger son Raoul, circa 1084. So says Dom. Morice, in his "Histoire de Bretagne," and M. de Pommereul, who follows him in his History of the Barons of Fougeres ("l'Art de Vérifier les Dates," vol. xiii. p. 270, edit. 1818). This would be fairly borne out by the date of Domesday, at which a Raoul is stated to hold certain lands in Surrey, Devonshire, Buckinghamshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk.

But then who was William? The first William de Fougeres that I can find mention of was one of the seven children of Raoul by Avoyse or Avicia, daughter of Richard de Bienfaite, and as he was certainly not the eldest son, Raoul being succeeded first by Meen III., who died without issue, and he by Henri I., the next brother, in 1137, William, their younger brother, could surely not be of sufficient age to hold lands in England in 1085. There must be either some great confusion of dates or there was a William de Fougeres unknown to Morice or his copyist. The account of Raoul is very vague.

Long before he succeeded his father we are told

he had given proofs of his valour, by following William Duke of Normandy to the conquest of England. By that prince he was put in possession of large territories, out of which he made various donations to the Abbey of Risle and to that of Savigny, which he founded in 1112. He confirmed the foundation of the Priory of the Holy Trinity by his mother, Adelaide, and gave it, as well as the Church of Saint Sulpice at Fougeres, to the Abbey of Marmoutier. Subsequently he travelled to Rome, and passing by Marmoutier, confirmed all his previous gifts to it. He died in 1124, leaving by his wife aforesaid seven children—Meen, Henri, Gauthier, Robert, Guillaume, Avelon, and Beatrice.

Now if these dates can be depended on, and they are not materially affected by any test I have been able to apply to them, it is not surprising that Le Prévost should doubt the presence of Raoul at Hastings, between which event and that of his death there would elapse fifty-eight years. Still, allowing him to have been a young man of two-and-twenty in 1066, he would have been only eighty in 1124—not an improbable age for him to have attained, and we have no evidence to show that he did not do so. Unless we could prove that he was too young to fight at Senlac in 1066, the benefit of the doubt must be accorded to him.

He was therefore, we may conclude, the companion of the Conqueror and the tenant in Domesday: but this does not advance us a step in our knowledge of the William de Fougeres in the same record. He must have been born before 1066 to have held land in capite in 1085, and as William, the son of Raoul and Avicia, had certainly two if not four elder brothers, not counting the sisters whose births might have intervened, we must date the marriage of Raoul as far back as 1060 at least, which would make a serious addition to the venerable age I have already accorded to him.

We have two later Williams, who of course are quite out of the question, but whom I must mention, in order to correct a serious error in "l'Art de Vérifier les Dates," which its authors have been led into by Morice, tending to create the greatest confusion.

Henri Baron of Fougeres, second son of Raoul I., and brother of Meen, whom he succeeded, had, by his wife, Olive de Bretagne, three sons—Raoul, Frangal, and Guillaume. Raoul, the eldest, succeeded his father as Raoul II. The above writers give him two wives, and make him father, without distinguishing the mothers, of four sons—Geoffrey, Juhel, Guillaume, and Henri—the eldest of whom, they say, succeeded him. Mr. Stapleton has clearly shown that Geoffrey

was not the son, but the grandson of Raoul II., being the only son of Guillaume (William) de Fougeres, who died in his father's lifetime, 7th June, 1187, leaving issue this Geoffrey, a minor at his grandfather's death in 1194, and in ward to his great-uncle, Guillaume, and an only daughter, Clemencia, married first to Alain de Dinant, and secondly, to Ranulph Blondeville, Earl of Chester.

There are many other inaccuracies involved with this in the account of Raoul and his family, but with them I have no business here. The important one affecting the pedigree of the Earls of Chester I could not pass without notice. The seal of William de Fougeres (Cotton. Charters, 52 A, 15) affords us an interesting example of "armes parlantes." The shield is simply charged with branches of fern (*fougère*).

ERRAND DE HARCOURT.

"The Sire de Herecourt was also there riding a very swift horse, and gave the Duke all the aid he could." *Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,769. La Roque, the French historian of the house of Harcourt, names the member of that family who accompanied William to England, Errand, and he has been followed by Père Anselm and other genealogists. Le Prévost views him sus-

piciously, and calls him a person little known, and much less authentic than his father, Anchetil, or his brother Robert, the first Sire d'Harcourt of that name. I do not participate in these suspicions. I believe him to have been a veritable companion of the Conqueror, and shall adduce my reasons presently for taking a particular interest in him.

The family of Harcourt, illustrious on both sides of the Channel, is fairly enough shown by La Roque to have descended from Bernard the Dane, Governor and Regent of Normandy, A.D. 912, and from the same stock he derives the Sires de Beaumout, Comtes de Meulent, the Barons of Cancelles and St. Paer, the Lords of Gournay and Milly, the Barons of Neubourg, the Viscounts of Evreux, the Earls of Leicester and Warwick, and many other French and English noble houses.

Turketil, Seigneur de Turqueville and de Tanqueraye, named *circa* 1001 in several charters concerning the Abbeys of Fécamp and Bernay, is identical according to La Roque with the Thurkild or Thorold, Lord of Neufmarché-en-Lions, the governor of the boy-Duke William, who was treacherously assassinated by the hirelings of Raoul de Gace (*vide* vol. i., p. 16), and was the second son of Torf, the son of Bernard. The wife of Turketil was Anceline, sister of Toustain,

Seigneur de Montfort-sur-Risle, and their issue two sons, Anchetil and Walter, and one daughter, Leceline de Turqueville, who married William, Comte d'Eu, the natural son of Richard I., Duke of Normandy.

Anchetil, the eldest son, was the first who assumed the name of Harcourt, from the bourg of Harcourt near Brionne, and was present with his father, Turketil, at the confirmation of the foundation of the Abbey of Bernay, by Judith, Duchess of Normandy, in 1014. By Eve de Boessey, Dame de Boessey-le-Chapel, he had seven sons and one daughter, the eldest son being the Errand de Harcourt asserted to have been the companion of the Conqueror.

We have no dates of births, marriages, or any other events which would assist us to form an idea of the age of Errand at the time of the Conquest. His father Anchetil must have been a mere child when he witnessed with his father the confirmation charter of Bernay.

His father was murdered shortly after 1035, and Anchetil must therefore have been of mature age in 1066. Still, according to the genealogy, he survived his eldest son, and was succeeded by his second son Robert, who was living in 1100, and father of Philip Harcourt, Bishop of Salisbury, 1140.

From Robert all is clear, but it is with his eldest

brother Errand and his younger ones that we have to do. Why Errand should have been selected as the Sire d'Harcourt who fought at Senlac, if Robert had really been the man, is incomprehensible. The vice of ancient genealogists was the endeavour to exalt the character and exaggerate the valorous achievements of the ancestors of the family, to the extent even of inventing stories to account for armorial devices which they could not comprehend, or sobriquets they took no trouble to trace to their origin. Had Robert, who was Sire d'Harcourt when Wace wrote, been present in the battle, some tradition would surely have been preserved in the family and eagerly recorded by its historian.

That Errand "is little known" is no reason for doubting his presence at Hastings. How many were there of whom we know nothing at all? How many, I grieve to say, are named even in these pages of whom we know next to nothing? That he should be less known than his father and brother is not at all surprising, as it is evident from the fact of Robert's succession that Errand died during his father's lifetime, leaving no male issue by his wife, who was of the family of Estouteville.

Jean le Féron informs us that he returned to Normandy in 1078, and probably died soon after, as from

that period we hear no more of him. But I must have yet another word with M. le Prévost. He accuses the English genealogists of having fabricated an apocryphal affiliation in order to show that the English branch of the Harcourts came in with the Conqueror, and for this purpose have created a Gervase, a Geoffrey, and an Arnold de Harcourt, whom they pretend were all three present in the battle of Hastings; and he adds, that according to La Roque it was Raoul, second son of Robert II., Baron de Harcourt, who being attached to King John, quitted France and became the second ancestor of the Harcourts of England.

"We will not," he says in conclusion, "guarantee this assertion of a not very scrupulous historian, but we can affirm that those of the English genealogists are utterly false."

Now disregarding the very strong language in which this learned and generally courteous gentleman has pronounced his opinion, he has made a singular mistake in accusing our genealogists of having created Harcourts in order to fabricate a pedigree.

If there be any fabrication it is the work of his own countrymen, and we can only be blamed for believing them. Père Anselm, following La Roque, states that Anchetil had by his wife, Eve de Boessey, seven sons,

Errand, Robert, Jean, *Arnoul*, *Gervais*, Yves, and Renauld de Harcourt.

Here are two, at any rate, out of the three laid at the door of the genealogist, and what proof that they are apocryphal? What evidence to show that they were not at Hastings with their brother Errand? That an Arnoul de Harcourt was in England, and killed in a skirmish with the Welsh either in the mysterious battle of Cardiff in 1094, according to the Welsh Chronicles, or in some one of the other frays which have been mixed with it by the Norman historians, I think there can be little doubt. At all events, the name is not likely to have been invented by the Welsh, and there is nothing in the date to prevent his being the son of Anchetil, recorded by La Roque. It may be quite true that the Harcourts did not settle in England before the reign of John, but how does that prove that none of their ancestors fought at Senlac?

WILLIAM PAINEL.

The important family of Paisnel, Painel or Paganell, as it is variously written in French or English documents (latinised Paganellus), were Lords of Moustiers-Hubert, in the arrondissement of Lisieux.

"Des Moustiers-Hubert Painals"

is named by Wace in his "Roman de Rou" (l. 13,630), in company with Avenel de Biarz and Robert Bertram the Crooked, as killing many of the English.

Le Prévost remarks that there are two ways of reading the above line—"Hubert Paisnel of Moustiers," or "Paisnel of Moustiers-Hubert," and adopts the latter as the more correct, the Paisnels being the ancient proprietors of the district so called, a William Paisnel, who founded the Abbey of Hambie in 1145, making sundry donations to it derivable from his forest and castle of Moustiers-Hubert. He therefore suggests that the Painel of Wace was an earlier William, who is mentioned by Orderic as dying about the same time as the Conqueror.

In the Roll printed by Leland of the noble Normans who came into England with William the Conqueror, absurdly represented as specially the followers of William de Mohun, the name occurs of *Hubert* Paignel; but that is evidently only the copyist's interpretation of the language of Wace, and little doubt can exist that it was the William Paisnel mentioned by Orderic who was in the army at Hastings, and who subscribed a charter to the Cathedral of Bayeux in 1073. He is said by Orderic to have

died "about the same period" as King William. It must have been a year or so before him, as Ralph Painel is the tenant in Domesday, holding forty-five lordships in 1085, and no mention is made of William, to whom he had succeeded either as son or brother. This Ralph founded, in 1089 (second William Rufus), the Priory of the Holy Trinity at York for nuns, on the site of a house for canons which had been destroyed by that devoted son of the Church, the Conqueror.

Either Ralph, or his son Fulk Painel, married Beatrice, daughter and sole heir of William Fitz Ansculph, a probable companion of the Conqueror, and the possessor of vast domains in England at the time of the survey, the greater portion, if not all, of which she brought into the family of Painel, particularly her father's principal seat, Dudley Castle, in the county of Stafford, which was demolished in the reign of Henry II., in consequence of Gervase Painel, the then possessor, being in rebellion.

WALTER D'AINCOURT.

The name of D'Aincourt is not mentioned by Wace, unless it has been derived from Driencourt, a suggestion thrown out by Mr. Taylor which I am by no means inclined to adopt, as the original name of Neufchatel-en-Bray was Drincourt (Driencuria), and

we have evidence of a family of that name being in existence previous to the Conquest. In a cartulary of the Abbey of the Holy Trinity du-Mont-de-Rouen, under the date of 1030, the names are found of Richard de Drincourt, Harold de Drincourt, and Hugh de Drincourt; and Monsieur de la Mairie,* to whom we are indebted for this information, tells us also that a Sire de Drincourt, who accompanied Duke William in his expedition to England, was killed in the battle of Hastings, a circumstance which would account for his name not appearing in Domesday. The name of the place itself also gradually disappeared at the commencement of the twelfth century, being called "Le Neufchatel de Drincort," from a castle built there by Henry I. in 1106, and subsequently Neufchatel only. It would seem that the Sire de Driencourt slain at Senlac was the last of the family.

The Aincourts derived their name from a parish in the Vexin-Normand, between Mantes and Magny so called, the patronage of which was given by one of the descendants of Walter to the Abbey of Bec.

The services of Walter d'Aincourt, whatever they may have been, were rewarded by the Conqueror with the gift of fifty-five lordships in England, of which

* Recherches sur le Bray Normand et le Bray Picard. Tom. i., p. 233.

Blankney in Lincolnshire was one, and made by him the head of his barony.

Of his origin and antecedents no more is known than of his actions. Contemporary history is entirely silent about him. We do not find him engaged in any combat, intrusted with any office, employed on any mission, founding or endowing any monastic establishment, or even witnessing a charter, and might well doubt his having ever existed but for the enumeration of his possessions in Domesday, and the epitaph of his son William in Lincoln Cathedral, on a leaden plate found in his grave in the churchyard there. From that we learn that he was a kinsman of Remi or Remigius, Bishop of Lincoln, who, according to Taylor's List, contributed a ship and twenty knights or men-at-arms to the fleet of Duke William, a fact that leads one to the conclusion that the lucky Walter owed his barony to the good offices of the bishop, and not to any merit of his own..

His son William is stated in his epitaph to have been in some way descended from royalty. "Præfatus Willielmus regiæ stirpe progenitus." How provoking are these vague insinuations. The descent must have been through his mother, as the wording of the sentence expressly limits the honour to William, and not even her baptismal name is known to us.

William died in the reign of Rufus, leaving a son and heir named Ralph, who was the founder of Thurgarton Priory. The male line became extinct in the twenty-first of Henry VI., by the death of Robert, uncle of William, last Baron d'Eyncourt, when Margaret and Alice, sisters of the said William, were found his heirs and carried the estates into the families of Cromwell and Lovel.

SAMSON D'ANSNEVILLE.

Wace records, as forming one of a troop or company of Norman knights who charged together, "fearing neither stake nor fosse, and overthrowing and killing may a good horse and man," a certain "Sire de Val de Saire." M. le Prévost rather too hastily observes in a note on this passage: "Our author takes Val de Saire for the name of a lordship, while it is that of a canton in the peninsular of the Cotentin. The mistake is still more extraordinary for him to have made, as that part of the province was well known to him."

The commentator has himself fallen into an error. He seems not to have been aware that there was a noble Norman family of the name of Ansneville, derived from, or given by them to a parish in Val de Saire, of which they were the lords.

The chronicle of the Abbey of St. Etienne at Caen,

as well as the history of the Island of Guernsey, furnish us with the earliest information respecting the family of Ansneville. Previous to the year 1050, some pirates from the Bay of Biscay repeatedly ravaged the Island of Guernsey, at that time belonging to Normandy, and finally established themselves there. The inhabitants not being able to eject them, applied to their Duke, William, for assistance. He was at that time at his favourite residence at Valognes, and immediately sent a force under the command of Samson d'Ansneville, who destroyed the forts built by the pirates, and drove them out of the island, to which they never returned.

In 1061, according to an entry of that date in an Exchequer Roll at Rouen, Duke William gave to Samson d'Ansneville, "his esquire," and to the Abbey of Mont St. Michael, half of the Isle of Guernsey in equal portions, the said Samson d'Ansneville engaging for himself and his heirs to serve the Duke and his successors as esquires of the body whenever they came into the island, to pay ten livres for livery of the land, do homage, and perform all other services due to the Duke and the duchy.

In 1066, at the time of the Conquest, and during the regency of Queen Matilda, a Seigneur d'Ansneville was Governor of the Val de Saire, and in Domesday

occur the names of William and Humphrey Ansneville as subtenants, the former of Earl Roger de Montgomeri in Hampshire, and the latter of Eudo Dapifer in Hertfordshire.

The authors of "Researches sur le Domesday" assume that the Seigneur d'Ansneville, Governor of Val de Saire in 1066, was a brother of Samson, and that William and Humphrey were his sons, he Samson being deceased previous to the compilation of the survey. Without speculating upon the relationship to each other of these personages, I will only point out that the connection of the family of Ansneville, Ansleville, Asneville, and Anneville, its latest form as now borne by the descendants in France, with the canton of Val de Saire would fully justify Master Wace in designating the particular member of it in the Duke's army as a "Sire" (he does not say "Seigneur") "de Val de Saire."

In a more corrupted form the family name may be recognised in the Roll of Battle Abbey in Andeville, while in Brompton's List, by the amalgamation of the "de" with it, it becomes Dandevile (d'Aundevyle), under which it is familiar to us in England.

Which of the Ansnevilles fought at Senlac I will not presume to guess; but Samson was a contemporary and a liegeman of the Duke, sworn to do him

suit and service, and I have therefore placed his name at the head of this notice.

HAMO DE CRÈVECŒUR.

Wace speaks of a Sire "de Crèvecœur," who, in company with those of Driencourt and Briencort, followed the Duke wherever he went in the battle.

I think he might have spoken in the plural, for it is highly probable that two of the family were in the Duke's army.

You have already heard of Hamon-aux-Dents, or "with the teeth," who was killed in the battle of Val-ès-Dunes in 1045. He left two sons, the eldest Hamo or Hamon, who became Dapifer to King William, and the second Robert, both of whom subscribe a charter of the Conqueror to the Abbey of St. Denis, at Paris. The latter appears to have died without legitimate issue before Domesday was compiled. Hamo, the Dapifer, was sheriff of Kent, and one of the judges in the cause between Lanfranc and Odo, Bishop of Bayeux. He had two sons, the eldest, Robert Fitz Hamon, a prominent personage in the reign of Rufus and of Henry I., the founder of Tewkesbury and father of Mabel, wife of Robert de Caen, Earl of Gloucester. Of the second son, Hamo, nothing

appears absolutely known, but I believe him to be the progenitor of that family of Crèvecœur, the last male of which, Hamon de Crèvecœur, married, temp. Richard I., Maude d'Avranches, the great heiress of Folkestone.

But who then was the Sire de Crèvecœur who fought at Senlac? We must hark back to examine that question.

Hamon-aux-Dents was Lord of Thorigny and Creulli; but, dying in rebellion, his estates would be forfeited, and we consequently find his grandson, Robert Fitz Hamon, coming over to England with Duke William, described as a young man, Lord of Astremeville, in Normandy,* a designation soon lost sight of in the great honour of Gloucester bestowed upon him by Rufus, his conquest of Glamorgan, and the lordships of a host of manors and castles seized or given to him by Jestin ap Gurgunt for his assistance against Rhys, Prince of South Wales, in 1091.

His father is only known as Hamo the Dapifer, or "Hamo Vice-comes," holding certain lands in England, but not as the possessor of any seigneurie in Normandy. Hasted, however, asserts that his family-name was Crèvecœur, implying, of course, his possession of a fief of that name, Crèvecœur-en-Auge, in the

* Dugdale, Mon. Ang. vol. i. p. 154.

arrondissement of Lisieux, which might have passed to his son Hamon, Robert succeeding to Astremeville.

If Hasted had satisfactory authority for his assertion, and I have found nothing whatever to contradict or throw the least doubt upon it, Hamo the Dapifer must surely have been "the Sire de Crèvecœur" of the "Roman de Rou." Robert Fitz Hamon, we know, had no male issue but Hamon; Fitz Hamon I take to be the father of the first Robert de Crèvecœur of whom we are cognizant, who, in 1119, founded the Priory of Leeds, in Kent, and had, by his wife Rohais, three sons, Adam, Elias, and Daniel, and a daughter named Gunnora.

He was succeeded by Daniel, who, in the 12th of Henry II., on assessment of aid for the marriage of the King's daughter, certified to the possession of fourteen knights' fees "de veteri feoffemento," and his son and successor, another Robert, was the father of Hamon, the last of the race and name, who married the heiress of Folkestone.

PICOT DE SAY.

"Cil de Saie," mentioned by Wace (l. 13,712), is supposed to be Picot de Say, one of a family deriving their name from Say, near Argentan, the lords of

which were vassals of Roger de Montgomeri in Normandy, as well as subsequently in England.

In 1060, Robert Picot de Say, Adeloyse his wife, their sons Robert and Henri, and Osmelin de Say and Avitia his wife, were benefactors to the Church of St. Martin of Séez, and in Domesday we find Picot de Say registered holding under Earl Roger twenty-nine manors in Shropshire. In 1083 he was amongst the barons invited by the Earl to witness his foundation of the Abbey of Shrewsbury. He had probably followed his feudal lord to England in 1067, and would not, therefore, in that case have been at Senlac; but, at the same time some of the family might have been in the invading army, and as Wace has represented Roger de Montgomeri as a leader in it, he would be likely to name one of his principal vassals as fighting in his company. Picot appears to have been the hereditary name of the family, it being sometimes used by itself, as in the instance of Picot Vicecomes, or Picot of Cambridge, one of the founders of the Priory of Barnwell, or with a baptismal name prefixed to it, as in that of Robert Picot de Say above mentioned. It it doubtful, however, whether the Picot of Cambridge was of the same family as Picot de Say, and it is the name of Say that is most prominent in Anglo-Norman history; Enguerrand de Say having been a distin-

guished warrior in the reign of Stephen and William de Say, and by his marriage with Beatrice, sister of Geoffrey de Mandeville, Earl of Essex, increasing the wealth and power of both families.

A William de Say, the grandfather of that William, married Agnes, daughter of Hugh de Grentmesnil (see page 83, *ante*), and might have been in the battle with his father-in-law, as confidently stated in the pedigree of the Lords Say and Sele, who deduce their descent from him through the family of Fiennes, as do also the Dukes of Newcastle.

The Pigots, or Pigotts, assume to be the descendants of the Norman Picots of Domesday, one family from the Shropshire and the other from the Cheshire branch. We have nothing, however, but probability to guide us in our attempt to identify the actual companion of the Conqueror indicated by Master Wace, nor have we any materials for the biography of any Sire de Say who might be entitled to that distinction.

CHAPTER X

ROBERT BERTRAM.
HUGH DE PORT.
WILLIAM DE COLOMBIÈRES.
ROBERT D'ESTOUTEVILLE.
WILLIAM PEVEREL.

ROBERT BERTRAM.

"Robert Bertram, ki esteit torz."
Rom. de Rou, l. 13,634.

HERE we have not only the baptismal name, but a personal description to assist us in identifying this companion of the Conqueror. "Robert Bertram, who was crooked, but was very strong on horseback, had with him a great force, and many men fell before him."

Notwithstanding these particulars, and the fact that Bertram, surnamed "le Tort," or the crooked, is a real personage, who was Seigneur of Briquebec, near Valonore, who founded, before the Conquest, the Priory of "Beaumont-en-Auge," and on his death bed (*imminente morte*) made sundry donations to the Abbey of

St. Stephen at Caen, about 1082, M. le Prévost tells us it is commonly considered that it was not Robert Bertram who took part in the expedition, but William Bertram, probably his brother; and also that he was son or grandson of Toustain de Bastenbourg, progenitors of the Lords of Briquebec and those of Montfort.

Mr. Taylor presumes that both William and Robert were in the battle, which I will not dispute; but I believe Wace to be right in this instance, as well as in many others which have been questioned but not disproved. Robert Bertram was evidently dead before the compilation of Domesday; and Dugdale makes no mention of him, beginning his account of the family with William, Baron of Mitford, who, with the consent of Hawise his wife, as also of Roger, Guy, William, and Richard, his sons, founded, temp. Henry I., the Priory of Brinkholm, Northumberland, for canons regular of the order of St. Augustin. The branch of the Bertrams of Bothall I take to be the eldest, and Richard, the first of that line mentioned, to have been a grandson of Robert, as he held the barony of Bothall in capite of the King, Henry II., by the service of three knights' fees, as his ancestors had done, "de veteri feoffemento," and confirmed to the monks of Loirmouth two sheaves out of his lordship

of Bothall, which they had of the gift of his ancestors.

The male line of the Bertrams of Mitford failed in the reign of Edward II., and that of Bothall in the reign following. Agnes, eldest sister and co-heir of Roger, the last Baron of Mitford, married Sir Thomas Fitzwilliam of Sprotborough, an ancestor of the Earls Fitzwilliam.

HUGH DE PORT.

"Cil de Port," alluded to by Wace (*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,613), may have been either Hugh or Hubert de Port, a commune in the Bessin, near Bayeux, for both are reported to have been in the battle, but I have specially named Hugh, as, from his share of the spoil, it is evident he must have been the most prominent in the fight for it, "slaying many English that day." At the time of the survey he held fifty-five manors in Hampshire of the King, one of which was Basing, the head of his barony; likewise twelve more of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux (in whose company most likely he came); one in Dorsetshire, and two in Cambridgeshire; in all seventy lordships.

We hear nothing more about him till the ninth of Rufus (1096), in which year he gave to the monks of Gloucester his lordship of Littletone, in Northampton-

shire, a subsequent acquisition, probably by marriage, and assuming the monastic habit at Winchester, ended his days there, leaving, by an unnamed wife, Henry, his son and heir, who founded the Priory of Shirebourn, near Basing.

A Gilbert as well as a Hubert de Port appears as witness to various charters from 1080 to 1082.

Adam de Port, grandson of the Henry above mentioned, married Mabel de Aurevalle, daughter and heir of Muriel de St. John, whose grandfather, William de St. John, is stated to have been a companion of the Conqueror, which is possibly true; but he is also described as the "Grand Master of Artillery"—a title which would mislead a reader who was not sufficiently an antiquary to know that Artillaria was a term in use long before the invention of cannon, and signified munitions of war in general, but more especially the machines constructed for the purpose of casting heavy stones and other missiles, movable towers for assaulting a castle, battering rams, &c. It would be interesting to discover what authority there is for this family tradition. In the Bayeux Tapestry we see men bearing body armour and lances to the ships, but no catapults, mangonels, or balistæ; nor does Wace or any other author speak of such engines being conveyed on board the fleet to England; but in the wider sense of

the word, as may be seen by reference to Ducange, William de St. John might have been Magister Artillariæ, having the care of all the military stores, armour, and weapons included.

The son of Adam de Port and Mabel de Aurevalle assumed the name of St. John as representative of his mother's family; and from his great-grandson John, Lord St. John of Basing, descended the Marquises of Winchester, the Dukes of Bolton, the Barons St. John of Bletshoe, the Viscounts Grandison, the Earls of Jersey, and the Earls and Viscounts Bolingbroke.

> "Awake, my St. John, leave all minor things
> To low ambition and the pride of kings."

Pope has done more to immortalize the name of St. John than the Grand Master of the Artillery of William the Conqueror.

WILLIAM DE COLOMBIÈRES.

Little is known of this personage mentioned by Wace (*Rom. de Rou*, l. 13,462) beyond the fact of the occurrence of his name in a charter in favour of the Abbey aux Dames at Caen in 1032.

He was probably deceased before the compilation of Domesday, in which a Rannulph de Columbels is returned as the holder of sundry manors in Kent, the reward of the services rendered to the Conqueror

either by Rannulph himself or the William of Wace, whom he might have succeeded. Colombières is in the arrondissement of Bayeux, and it is worthy of note that in the charter above mentioned a Raoul d'Asnières is found in company with the Lord de Columbières. Asnières being in the same arrondissement, and "Gilbert le viel d'Asnières" coupled with "Willame de Columbieres" in the "Roman de Rou," it is fairly presumable that they were near connections as well as near neighbours. The family of Colombières (Columbers, Columbels) alone appears to have struck root in England, and had become an important baronial family in the reign of Henry II., in the 12th of whose reign Philip de Columbers accounted for ten knights' fees "de veteri feoffemento" and one "de novo," and in the 22nd of the same reign paid twenty marks for trespassing in the King's forests. Dugdale's account only begins with this Philip, and he has not noticed that in a Plea Roll of Henry II. Roger Bacon is set down as brother to Philip de Columbers, nor that a Gilbert de Columbers was a contemporary of Philip and settled in Berkshire. (Lib. Niger.)

The family of Columbers intermarried with the families of Chandos and Courtenai, and were Seigneurs of Dudevill, in Normandy; but the male line failed in England towards the close of the 13th century.

ROBERT D'ESTOUTEVILLE.

The "Sire d'Estoteville" of the "Roman de Rou" (l. 13,561) was in all probability Robert, surnamed Fronteboeuf, Granteboef, or, according to the French antiquaries, Grand-bois; but whether he was of Estouteville-sur-Cailly or Estouteville-sur-Mer may be an open question. There was a knightly family deriving their name from the former (at present a commune in the canton of Bouchy, arrondissement de Rouen), one of whom, Nicholas d'Estouteville, the great-great-grandson of Robert, married Gunnor or Gunnora, daughter of Hugh IV. de Gournay, and widow of Robert de Gant, in the 12th century, and received with her in dower the manors of Beddingfield and Kimberly in Norfolk, which remained for many generations in the family of Stuteville, as it is called in England. This Estouteville was formerly a *mouvance, i.e.*, a dependency on the fief of La Ferté-en-Brai, of which the Gournays were the lords, and it is therefore likely that Robert d'Estouteville followed Hugh II. de Gournay to England in the invading army.

Dugdale's account of him and his son is very meagre and incorrect, and neither M. le Prévost nor

Mr. Edward Taylor has taken any trouble on the subject, although some information has been furnished us by Orderic which enables me to correct Dugdale and answer the observation of M. le Prévost, echoed by Mr. Taylor, that he (Robert) must have been very young if he was the same who fell forty years after at Tenchebrai, in 1106, by the simple assurance to them that he was not the same.

Some ten or eleven years previous to the Conquest, Robert I. d'Estouteville was governor of the Castle of Ambrières, and stoutly defended it against Geoffrey Martel until relieved by the approach of Duke William. He could not therefore have been very young even at that time—say between twenty and thirty, and in 1066 he would have been between thirty and forty. Of his exploits at Senlac we hear nothing, and his name does not appear in Domesday, so we are in ignorance of the reward, if any, which he received for his services. The latest mention of him is by Orderic, who records him as a witness to a confirmation charter of William son of Fulk de Querneville, Dean of Evreux, to the Abbey of Ouche or St. Evroult, before the year 1089.

The date of his death is unascertained; but he was succeeded by his son Robert II. d'Estouteville, altogether omitted by Dugdale, but in connection with

whom the following strange story is told by Orderic (lib. xi., cap. xiii.) :—

"The same year (1106) the following occurrence happened in Normandy :—Robert d'Estoteville, a brave and powerful baron, was a strong partizan of the Duke (Robert Court-heuse), and superintended his troops and fortresses in the Pays de Caux. It chanced on Easter-day (9th of April, 1105-6), as his chaplain was administering the holy sacrament to the baron and his household, that a certain knight having approached the altar for the purpose of reverently receiving the Eucharist, the priest took the consecrated wafer in his hand for the purpose of putting it into the mouth of the communicant, but found that he was quite incapable of lifting his hand from the altar. Both parties were exceedingly terrified by this circumstance, but at length the priest said to the knight, 'Take it if you can ; for myself, it is out of my power to move my hand and deliver the Lord's body to you.' Upon this the knight stretched his neck over the altar, with some effort reached the chalice, and received the Host in his open mouth from the priest's hand. This extraordinary occurrence covered him with confusion, and apprehending some misfortune, but of what nature he knew not, he distributed in consequence the greatest portion of his wardrobe and other pro-

perty amongst the poor and clergy. He was slain soon after Easter in the first battle fought at Maromme, near Rouen.

"The chaplain, whose name was Robert, related to me what happened to him and the unfortunate knight, as I have stated, during the celebration of the life-giving mysteries."

The effect of this alarming miracle on Robert, the Lord of Estouteville, and his family, who were witnesses of it, is not recorded, but it is possible they might have some gloomy forebodings as respected themselves, which were speedily verified; for Robert, the son and heir of this Robert II., was taken prisoner by King Henry I. a few months afterwards, at the storming of Dive, and his father also at the battle of Tenchebrai, closely following. The son was liberated; but the elder Robert was sent a captive to England and immured for life in a dungeon, and the whole of his estates were seized and bestowed by King Henry on Nigel de Albini, ancestor of the second race of the Mowbrays.

It was Robert III. de Stoteville, or Stuteville, the young knight who was taken at Dive, who distinguished himself in the battle of the Standard (temp. Stephen), and was made sheriff of Yorkshire by Henry II., in the sixteenth year of his reign,

and who was in possession at that time of seven or eight knights' fees in England, how acquired does not appear, but as he was twice married, his second wife being Sibilla, sister of Philip de Valoines, it is probable that some of the lands came to him with his wives. Thorpenhow, in the county of Cumberland, he certainly had in frank marriage with the latter. He also it was who, with Ranulph de Glanville and Bernard de Balieul, defeated the Scots near Alnwick (20 Henry II.), and took their king prisoner. He then laid claim to the barony of Roger de Mowbray, which had been given to Nigel, Roger's father, by Henry I., as above mentioned, and would therefore seem to have been held by his father and forfeited by his adherence to Robert Court-heuse. A long suit, during which we are told the country in general favoured Stoteville's title, terminated in a compromise, Roger de Mowbray giving up the lordship of Kirkby Moorside, with its appurtenances, to Robert de Stoteville, to be held by the service of nine knights' fees.

This Robert de Stoteville founded two monasteries in Yorkshire, one at Rossedale and the other at Keldholme, and was a benefactor to the monks of St. Mary's Abbey in York. He also gave to the monks of Rievaulx all the lands between Redham and

Kirkby, for the health of the soul of Robert his grandfather, and for the souls of Robert his father, and Erneburga his mother, as also for the souls of Helewisa his wife, and William his son, Sibilla his second wife surviving him.

It is singular that although Dugdale has recited the provisions of this charter, and printed a pedigree which corresponds with it, he should have confounded the first Robert with the second, the second with the third, and invented a fourth, to whom he attributes the charter to the Abbey of Rievaulx.

There are other inaccuracies in his account of this family, but they are beyond my province in this work. I have travelled already sufficiently far out of the record in clearing up the extraordinary confusion of its commencement, which appears to have puzzled M. le Prévost and Mr. Taylor.

WILLIAM PEVEREL.

The omission of the name of this personage, the subject of so much controversy, by the author of the "Roman de Rou," is not so remarkable as his silence respecting Eustace, Count of Boulogne, whose rank in his own country, and the unenviable notoriety he had justly or unjustly acquired in England, would, we

should imagine, render it impossible for him to have been completely overlooked. Nor does the appearance of the name of Peverel in the Roll of Battle Abbey, Duchsne's List, the rhyming catalogue, and those recently compiled by Messrs. de Magny and Leopold Delisle, justify us in claiming for him, on their unsupported and very questionable authority, the right to be classed amongst the conquerors at Senlac.

At the same time we have no evidence, as in the cases of Roger de Montgomeri, Hugh d'Avranches, and Henry de Percy, to warrant our entertaining a contrary opinion. We must therefore give him the benefit of the doubt, particularly as we find him as early as 1068 in charge of the newly-built Castle of Nottingham, and at the time of the compilation of Domesday the lord of one hundred and sixty-two manors in England, and possessing in Nottingham alone forty-eight merchants' or traders' houses, thirteen knights' houses, and eight bondsmen's cottages, besides ten acres of land granted to him by the King to make an orchard, and the churches of St. Mary, St. Peter, and St. Nicholas, all three of which we find he gave with their land, tithe, and appurtenances by his charter to the Priory of Lenton.

Surely his services must have been most important —his reputation for valour and ability well established,

to have merited such magnificent rewards. To have obtained for him from the wary and suspicious Conqueror so important a trust as the custody of Nottingham Castle—at so early an age too—for if the date of his death in the register of St. James's, Northampton, one of his foundations, can be relied on, viz., 5th kalends of February, 1113 (1114 according to our present calculation), he could scarcely have been more than four or five-and-twenty at the time of his appointment.

How is it then that, previous to that period, no deed of arms is recorded of him? That in all the battles and commotions of which Normandy was the theatre during the thirty years preceding the Conquest, the name of Peverel, if such a family existed in the duchy, never crops up, even accidentally, in any of the pages of the contemporary chroniclers?

A Ranulph Peverel also appears in Domesday as the lord of sixty-four manors. Of a verity, the merits of these Peverels must have been great, or their influence at Court from some cause or another extraordinary.

Of course, if it were true, as we have hitherto been led to believe, that William Peverel was a natural son of William the Conqueror, not a word more need be wasted on the subject; but Mr. Eaton, in his History

of Shropshire, discredits the report, and Mr. Edward Freeman rejects it with contempt and indignation as the unvouched-for assertion of a Herald (see vol. i., p. 72).

I am unfortunate in being opposed in my opinion to two such great authorities; but until they produce something like evidence to support theirs, I cannot consent to surrender my own.

Let us dispassionately examine the arguments of the first dissenter, Mr. Eaton, who in refutation of the assertion says, "Its improbability arises in two ways. It is inconsistent with the general character of Duke William." To whom shall we refer for the general character of this master of dissimulation, who so thoroughly understood and practised the policy of assuming a virtue if he had it not? To his paid servants and courtly flatterers, Guillaume de Poitiers, his own chaplain, or Guy of Amiens, his wife's almoner, who, if he did write the "Carmen de Bello," I consider not worthy to be believed on his oath? These are the only actual contemporaries who could have informed us what was the Duke's general character for morality in Normandy in his own time, and they have not thought it worth while to do so.

William of Malmesbury, a writer of the reign of Henry II., is the first and only one in the twelfth

century* who praises him for the exercise of that single virtue that has been so ostentatiously paraded by his later panegyrists or apologists, and even he at the same time acknowledges that "there were not wanting persons who prated of matters" irreconcilable with such a reputation. I am therefore at a loss to discover "the general character of Duke William" which is the foundation of one of Mr. Eaton's arguments.

The other is easier to deal with, because it consists of matters of fact, not merely matters of opinion. "Moreover," he continues, "this alleged liaison with a Saxon lady of rank can have originated in no earlier circumstance than the event of the Duke's visit to the Court of Edward the Confessor in 1051. However, William Peverel must have been born before that period, for he was old enough in 1068 to be intrusted with one of the most responsible affairs in the kingdom —the custody of the castle and province from which he took his name."

The possibility never seems to have occurred to Mr. Eaton, that the Saxon lady of rank might have visited Normandy *before* 1051, a circumstance which would remove the only serious difficulty in the story. Wil-

* Roger of Wendover simply copies William of Malmesbury. No other writer alludes to the subject.

liam Peverel was no doubt of full age at the time of the Conquest, and might have been, as I have said, four or five-and-twenty when appointed to the government of Nottingham, and near upon seventy at the time of his death. According to this calculation he would have been born a year or so previous to Duke William's first proposal to Matilda of Flanders.

"Mystery," Mr. Eaton admits, "there certainly is about the whole subject, and the truth may very possibly be buried with some tale of courtly scandal, though not of the precise character hitherto pointed out."

The entire history of William Duke of Normandy up to the invasion of England is involved in mystery, and that of William Peverel might tend to elucidate some part of it.

If the Duke was not his father, as asserted and believed as early at least as the time of Camden and Glover, who could not have been the originator, as Mr. Freeman implies, of the "uncertified and almost impossible scandal"—who were his parents? Upon no occasion does he allude even to them; a most singular and significant fact. He founds and endows the Priory of Lenton, near Nottingham, for the health of the soul of King William and Matilda his wife, King William Rufus, King Henry I.

and Maud his consort, as also for the souls of William and Maud their children; and likewise for the health of his own soul and the souls of Adeline his wife, William his son, and all his other children. No mention of father or mother, nor of any ancestors whatever. He was, in fact, "nullus filius."

And how came it that the young "nameless adventurer," of whom nothing is previously known, was laden with wealth and honours, and selected from a host of noble, valiant, and experienced warriors for so important a command?

And next his name. I will not draw any inference from his baptismal one, though it certainly does not weaken the argument; but whence that of Peverel? Not from his place of birth, nor lands which he possessed, or we should somewhere find the Norman "de" prefixed to it.

One story is that the daughter of Ingelric, an Anglo-Saxon nobleman, and a benefactor if not the founder of the collegiate church of St. Martin-le-Grand, London, having been the mistress of Duke William and the mother by him of a son named after him, married subsequently Ranulph Peverel, who accompanied the Conqueror to England, and that not only the children born of that marriage, but also the Duke's son William, were thenceforth known by the name of

Peverel. The other version is, that the lady, by Leland called Ingelrica, and by Morant, Maud, was the wife of Ranulph Peverel before she became the mistress of the Duke,* whose son by her took the name of her husband's family.

One of these accounts must of course be inaccurate, but both agree respecting the main question at issue, are equally probable, and uncontradicted by any circumstantial evidence. The latter version disposes altogether of the second objection of Mr. Eaton, as the wife of Ranulph Peverel would naturally have been resident in Normandy when the Duke made her acquaintance, and therefore his assumption that the liaison *could* have originated in *no earlier* circumstance than the Duke's visit to King Edward in 1051 is shown to be erroneous, and in either case a much too hasty conclusion.

History, it has been said, repeats itself, and the account given by Dugdale of William's liaison with the daughter of Ingelric is curiously similar to that of his father Robert with the daughter of Fulbert the Furrier. The young prince, scarcely perhaps of age, is attracted by the beauty of a girl who becomes his mistress, and having borne him a son, marries, when *he* marries, a Norman knight by whom she has several children.

* "Cujus erat *pellex*." Camden, 445.

There is nothing remarkable in such circumstances, except their coincidence with those of Robert and Herleve, nor indeed in that, as they were of common occurrence in Normandy, and tolerated, if not sanctioned, as the custom of the country. And what if the existence not only of a wife *more Danico*, but of a son should have been one of the hitches in the matrimonial arrangements of William and Matilda of Flanders? Several good reasons might be adduced to show the bearing of this case on the mystery that still enshrouds the singular courtship of the lady and the unexplained prohibition of the Pope, but I have no desire to multiply theories which cannot be fairly supported by facts, and have only endeavoured to show as briefly as possible that there are better grounds for believing in the story than for contemptuously dismissing it. Tradition should always be received with great caution, but where not irreconcilable with dates, nor met by "rebutting evidence," it should not be hastily discarded as utterly unworthy of consideration.

We are not dealing with mystic personages. William Peverel of Nottingham, as well as Ranulph of Essex, had each a local habitation as well as a name. The latter was founder of the Priory of Hatfield Peverel, at the instigation of, or in conjunction with,

the daughter of Ingelric, his wife, or, as I believe, his mother. Weever, who tells her story in language too highly coloured for these pages, says she died about 1100, and was buried there. Her image, he states, was in his time to be seen carved in stone in one of the windows.

What have we against all this corroborative testimony? A denial, and an opinion!

The name of Peverel, as I have observed, was not derived from a fief or a locality. In a paper I read many years ago at Nottingham, I pointed out that Sir William Pole, in his Collections for Devonshire, speaking of the branch which settled in that county, says the name was Peverell or Piperell, and in Domesday we find it continually spelt "Piperellus—Terra Ranulphi Pipperelli." This, however, does not illustrate its derivation, and the detestable practice of latinising proper names only tends to confuse and mislead us, as they become in turn translated or corrupted till the original is either lost or rendered hopelessly inexplicable. My belief is, that like "Mesquin," lesser or junior, translated into Mischinus, and distorted into De Micenis, Peverel is the Norman form of Peuerellus, as we find it written in the Anglo-Norman Pipe and Plea Rolls. The *u* being pronounced *v* in Normandy, and Peuerellus being simply a misspelling

of the Latin Puerulus, a boy or child, naturally applied to the son to distinguish him from his father. William Peverel was therefore, literally, boy or child. William.

We see in the instance of the descendants of Richard d'Avranches how "Mesquin," used to distinguish a younger son, became the name of a family, and so I take it to have been with Peverel, which, originally applied to William, was afterwards borne by so many of his relations in England.

The Ranulph Peverel of Domesday I believe to have been William's half-brother. At any rate, he could scarcely have been the Ranulph who married the daughter of Ingelric, for we find his eldest son Hammo, or Hammond, a man grown, settled in England a few years after the Conquest, and one of the chief tenants or barons of Roger de Montgomeri, Earl of Shrewsbury. He is also reported to have had two other sons, Payne Peverel of Brune, and William Peverel of Dover; but I have no business with these in this place, and I fear I may have already wearied the reader with my attempt to affiliate William the child and controvert the recently formed opinion of the immaculate morality of William the father, which, notwithstanding they must have been all acquainted with the passage in Malmesbury, was

not entertained by Camden, Glover, Dugdale, Sandford, Weever, Thoroton, Deering, Morant, nor any genealogist or historian as far as I can remember to the middle of the present century, the erudite translator of Orderic, Mr. Thomas Forester, in 1853, unhesitatingly speaking of William Peverel of Nottingham as "the son of William the Conqueror," and "half-brother" of William Peverel of Dover.

I have no doubt in my own mind that the son of Robert and Herleve had at least three natural children, and should not be surprised if the mysterious Matilda of Domesday should prove to be a fourth.

The wife of William Peverel of Nottingham was Adelina de Lancaster, but her parentage is not ascertained. From her surname she may be supposed to have been the daughter of Roger de Poitou, son of Roger de Montgomeri, Earl of Shrewsbury, who was sometimes called Earl of Lancaster, in consequence of the large possessions in that county which he obtained with his wife, or perhaps one of the family of those Barons of Kendal of whom William of Lancaster was a wealthy and powerful person in the reigns of Henry I., Stephen, and Henry II., but we have nothing beyond the name to guide us.

This lady appears to have borne to her husband two sons, each named William, the elder dying in his

father's lifetime, 16 kalends of May, 1100, the last year of the reign of Rufus, and the other William succeeding him. She had also by him two daughters: Matilda, named in the Pipe Roll, 31st of Henry I., and Adeliza, wife of Richard de Redvers. Adelina was living as late as 1140, 5th of Stephen, when as "Adelina, mother of William Peverel of Nottingham," she was pardoned by the King eighteen shillings due for Danegeld in that year.

This second William Peverel of Nottingham we find, from the register of Lenton, deprived that monastery of the churches of Hexham and Randon, which his father, at the entreaty of his faithful wife Adelina, had bestowed on it at or nigh the time of its foundation; "but repenting, he, for the love of the worship of God, and for the safety of the souls of his said father and mother, by the consent of his heir William the younger restored them again."

Dugdale has made a strange confusion by mixing up the first with the second William Peverel of Nottingham, making the former, who died in 1114, a combatant at the battle of the Standard in 1138, and in 1141 at the battle of Lincoln, when King Stephen was taken prisoner, as well as William Peverel II., his staunch supporter.*

* Baronage, vol. i. p. 437, &c.

In the paper I read at Nottingham, which I have before alluded to, I think I proved pretty clearly that it was for his championship of Stephen that William Peverel II. was deprived of all his lands by Henry II., and not for poisoning Ranulph Earl of Chester, and also refuted the story of the Earl of Ferrers' marriage with any Margaret Peverel, no trace of such a person existing. My business here, however, is only with the companion, and, as I see no reason at present to doubt, the son of the Conqueror.

I have avowed my belief that William, II., Duke of Normandy, was father of at least three natural children.

1. William Peverel.
2. The wife of Hugh de Château-sur-Loir.
3. Thomas, Archbishop of York.

I have given above my reasons in full for adopting the statement of Camden and Glover respecting the first.

The responsibility of proving the second allegation I must leave to Mr. Forester, who has not stated the authority for his assertion. I found, however, that Père Anselm had long ago recorded the match without question or comment, and presume he obtained his information from the same source. The declaration of the Archbishop, previously unnoticed

by any one, I have already called attention to in the first volume of this work, but subsequent inquiry having strengthened my suspicions, and the question being raised by me for the first time, I cannot conclude this memoir without placing my facts before the dispassionate reader, leaving him to draw his own conclusions from them as I have done.

Here is the extract from the charter as printed by Olivarius, *verbatim et literatim.*

"In nomine, &c., Ego Willielmus divina dispensante misericordia, Rex Anglorum & Duc Normanorum, &c. Anno Dominica Incarnationis MLXXXI scripta est hæc charta & ab excellentiorabus regni personis testicata & confirmata, in nomine Dñi feliciter, Amen. Ego WILLIELMUS Dei gratia Anglorum Rex hoc præceptum possi scribere & scriptum signo Dominica Crucis confirmando impressi ✠. Ego MATHILDIS confirmavi ✠. Ego Lanfrancus Archæpisc ✠. Ego THOMAS Archiepiscopus Regis filius ✠. Ego Rogerius comes. Ego Hugo comes. Ego Alanus comes. Ego RODBERTUS comes. Ego Eustatius comes ✠. WILLIELMUS Regis filius ✠. Willielmus filius Osbert ✠. Walter de Gand ✠." (Arch. S. Pet. Gand.)

Observe that the name of Thomas is printed in capital letters, as are those of all the royal family,

while those of the Primate Lanfranc, the great Earls of Shrewsbury, Chester, Richmond, and Boulogne are in ordinary type.

What the distinction may have been in the charter itself, I cannot presume to say; but there can be no doubt there was a distinction of equal importance, or it would not have been thus indicated by Olivarius rendering the words "Regis filius" still more significant. Another remarkable circumstance is the occurrence of the name of a William, the son of Osbert, amongst the witnesses. The names of the parents of Archbishop Thomas are said to have been Osbert and Muriel, on the authority of some entries made from time to time in the blank spaces left in a calendar printed in an appendix to the Surtees Edition of the Liber Vitæ Dunelm., from a MS. marked B iv, 24, which belongs to the Dean and Chapter of Durham. "Februarius V. Kal. Mar. O' (biit) Osbertus Pater domini Archiepiscopi Thomæ."

"Junius V. Id. O' Muriel, Mater Domini Archiepiscopi Thomæ." No year stated.

These entries are assumed to apply to Thomas of Bayeux, the successor of Aldred, 1070—1100; but what proof is there that they do not refer to his nephew Thomas, Provost of Beverley, and Bishop-elect of London, who before consecration thereto was promoted to York, A.D. 1109, and who has been occa-

sionally confounded with his uncle of the same name and position? Be this as it may, we have in the above charter evidence of a William Fitz Osbert living in 1081, and subscribing a document in company with the Archbishop Thomas, who calls himself "Regis filius," though asserted by Brompton to be the son of a priest, "Namque presbyteri fuit filius."

Thomas of Bayeux had a brother named Samson, who was sent with him to Liége by Bishop Odo for his education. He was ordained a priest by Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, 14th June, 1096, at Lambeth, and consecrated Bishop of Worcester at St. Paul's Cathedral *the next day!* What influence could possibly have been at work to elevate and enrich in so remarkable a manner the sons of an obscure ecclesiastic, the married or unmarried priest Osbert?

Of course, as in the instance of Peverel, if Thomas was the son of William Duke of Normandy and King of England, the answer is obvious.

Well, the fortunate Thomas 1st had an equally fortunate nephew, Archbishop Thomas 2nd. Was he the son of Bishop Samson, or was he or not related to the William the son of Osbert who witnessed the Charter of William the Conqueror in company with Archbishop Thomas "Regis filius"?

The career of this Thomas of Bayeux and William Peverel are singularly similar. Each, without previous

distinction, was suddenly raised to rank and power on the first opportunity. Nothing is positively known of their parentage. Tradition, uncontradicted by facts, asserts Peverel to have been a son of King William, and Thomas declares himself another.

If the entry in the Calendar really refers to him, and Muriel was his mother, and not his sister-in-law, she could only have been the "*compayne*" of Osbert, as the marriage of priests was prohibited by the Synod of Lisieux and Rouen, and she therefore holds no higher position than Ingelric.

The story of Peverel could not have been the invention of an enemy, as in the eleventh century no shame was attached to such illicit connections. From Rolf the Dane to Robert the Devil, every ancestor of the Conqueror had left illegitimate issue, and therefore in the summary of his crimes and vices no contemporary would have dreamed of including incontinence. That neither Glover nor Camden ever questioned the fact, is to me sufficient evidence that they had satisfied themselves as to the authenticity of the information on which they had asserted it. They may have been deceived, but they did not invent the story, in which there is nothing incredible, and if false, has yet to be traced to its origin before we are justified in rejecting it.

CHAPTER XI.

—♦—

Of the following personages but few can be identified, and of those few no materials have been found hitherto for the briefest biographical notice.

To the meagre information and vague speculations of Messrs. le Prévost and Edgar Taylor I have added in some instances a fact, and in others a suggestion; and generally upheld the authority of Wace where it could not be shaken by direct evidence. I have already given my reasons for the confidence I place in his testimony, and feel assured that subsequent researches will justify my opinion of him.

The honest Prebend of Bayeux, at the conclusion of what may be fairly called his "Roll," candidly acknowledges, "Many other barons there were whom I have not even named, for I cannot give an account of them all, nor can I tell of all the feats they did, for I would not be tedious. Neither can I give the names of all the barons, nor the surnames of all whom the Duke brought from Normandy and Brittany in his company." Those, however, whom he has

named he had, I firmly believe, good authority for naming, and with one important exception (the presence of Roger de Montgomeri at Senlac), which is yet an open question, I have seen no reason to doubt his accuracy, or to endorse the opinion, that in specifying the baptismal names of the early Norman barons he has "*often* erred." He was much more likely to be right than his commentators in the nineteenth century, who, unless they can prove distinctly that no member of the family bore such a baptismal appellation in October, 1066, are not justified, except by the production of the most conclusive evidence, in asserting that he was not also a companion of the Conqueror.

The recently published lists of Messrs. de Magny and Delisle, while supplying some hundreds of names, are unfortunately unaccompanied by the evidence on which they have been recorded, and consequently cannot be confidently quoted either in corroboration or in contradiction of the older catalogues, varying as they do from them in many important instances, and occasionally from each other.

ABEVILE, Wiestace de, l. 13,562.—M. le Prévost merely remarks that there is a commune so named in the arrondissement of Lisieux, but that he thinks it more probable that Abbeville, the well-known city in

Ponthieu, is the locality indicated. I have mentioned in my memoir of Eustace, Count of Boulogne, the fact that both the Counts of Ponthieu and the Counts of Boulogne were occasionally called "of Abbeville." But strange as it appears that so remarkable a person as Eustace II. should have been altogether omitted by Wace, which he certainly has been if not alluded to as above, there is nothing to enable us to identify him with the unknown companion of the Conqueror recorded by the Prebend of Bayeux. He would surely have written "*Li quens* Wiestace de Abevile" had he intended to speak of Count Eustace. Who then was this Wiestace? No one of the name of Abbeville appears in Domesday. An obscure adventurer—a soldier of fortune, perhaps killed in the battle—would scarcely have been classed with the Chamberlain of Tankerville, the Lord of Mandeville, and William Crispin, or even mentioned at all by the Norman poet for the sake of the rhyme, unless he had distinguished himself in the conflict, or in some way made the name of Eustace of Abbeville familiar to his countrymen.

I am strongly under the impression that for Abbeville we should read Appeville, of which name there was more than one Norman family of note in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.

Three parishes so named are to be found in Normandy: 1. Appeville, canton of Montfort-sur-Risle, arrondissement of Pontaudemer; 2. Appeville-le-Petit, canton of Affranville, arrondissement of Dieppe; 3. Appeville-la-Haye, canton of Haye-du-Puits, arrondissement of Coutances. The lords of Montfort-sur-Risle were also seigneurs of Appeville, and several of their charters are subscribed by persons of that name, as are also some charters of the Counts of Meulent, sires de Pontaudemer. Gosce d'Appeville witnesses the gift of the hermitage of Brotone to the Abbey of Préaux, by Robert, Comte de Meulent, circa 1163. Appeville-le-Petit furnishes us with no indications; but Appeville-la-Haye was no doubt the cradle of a family so named. Our former acquaintance, Turstain Haldub, lord of Haye-du-Puits at the time of the Conquest, was also Seigneur d'Appeville; and from the foundation charter of the Abbey of Lessay we learn that he, with his son Eudo al Chapel, gave to that abbey all the churches, lands, woods, and meadows in *Apavil* and Osulfvill, "et aliis maisnillis quæ ad *Apavillam* pertinebant." Observe that Appeville is here spelt with one *p*, as Abbeville in the "Roman de Rou" is with one *b*. A very slight slip of the pen may have caused all the confusion.

Still stronger presumptive evidence is afforded us

by Domesday. Walterus de Appeville is therein recorded as holding, under William de Arcis, the manor of Folkestone, in the hundred of that name.

We have here distinct proof that an Appeville had established himself in England before 1085, and may fairly draw from it the inference, that either Walter himself or one of his family was a companion of the Conqueror in 1066. MM. de Magny and Delisle have *Gautier* (Walter) d'Appeville, but no Eustace. The name of Abbeville occurs in the Roll of Battle Abbey, but that is no evidence.

ASNEBEC (Onebac), "cil d'," l. 13,748.—Asnebec is a commune in the neighbourhood of Voie. M. le Prévost doubts that it was a seigneurie at the time of the Conquest, and believes it to have belonged to Robert, the younger son of Hamon-aux-Dents, the rebel lord of Thorigny killed at Val-ès-Dunes in 1047. That Robert succeeded his father in the lordship of Thorigny, as Le Prévost implies, is very problematical; but he may have been Sire d'Asnebec, and as such recognized in 1066, if he were in the invading army, which must first be ascertained. If not, "He of Onebec" remains for the present unidentified.

ASNIÈRES, "Gilbert le Viel d'," l. 13,663.—Asnières, a commune in the arrondissement of Bayeux. A Raoul

d'Asnières witnesses a charter to the Abbey-aux-Dames, at Caen, in 1082; but there is no trace of a Gilbert, nor mention of any of the family, in Domesday; neither do I find it in any form in the Rolls or lists of "the Conquerors" that have come down to us. Mr. Edgar Taylor, however, has noticed that in the Bayeux Inquest the Maulevriers, a well-known Anglo-Norman family, are found to hold half a knight's fee in Asnières, the only connection of it with this country yet discovered.

AUVILLIERS, "Sire d'," l. 13,747.—There are two communes of this name, one near Pont-l'Evêque, and the other near Mortemer-sur-Eaulne. As the "Sire d'Auvillers" is described by Wace as charging in company with Hugh de Mortemer, it is probable he hailed from the latter, and was a vassal of the Mortemers. A Hugh de *Aviler* was a vassal of Robert Malet, in Suffolk, in the days of the Conqueror, and a benefactor to the Priory of Eye, founded by him; but there is nothing to show who was the Sire d'Auvilliers who fought at Senlac.

BERTRAN, "de Peleit le filz," l. 11,510.—A Breton who joined the army of invasion at St. Valery, in company with the Sire de Dinan, Raoul de Gael, and many others of his countrymen. Nothing more appears to be known of him by any one; and "de

Peleit le filz Bertran" may be interpreted either as Bertrand the son of Peleit, or de Peleit the son of Bertrand, or Fitz-Bertrand de Peleit!

BRIENCORT, "le Sire de," l. 13,773.—No such place known in Normandy. Supposed by Le Prévost to be intended for Brucourt, arrondissement of Pont-l'Evêque. A Robert de Brucourt confirmed grants by Geffry de Fervaques to Walsingham, the only instance of the connection of the name with English affairs.

BONNEBOSQ, "le Sire de," l. 13,667.—From Bonnebosq, arrondissement of Pont-l'Evêque. No identification or connection with England.

BOTEVILAIN, l. 13,711.—A Sire de Bouttevile, arrondissement of Valognes, is certified by Mons. de Gerville to have been in the expedition. The name occurs in the Roll of Battle Abbey, and the family established itself in the counties of Somerset and Bedford. At the same time a family named Bouttevillain is found seated in Northamptonshire, in which county a Guillaume Boutevileyn founded, in 1143, the Abbey of Pipewell. This name appears in Brompton's List; but whether the Boutevilles and the Bouttevillains were one and the same family is left to conjecture, as well as who were the actual companions of the Conqueror. The Thynnes, Mar-

quises of Bath, claim descent from Boteville of Shelton, county of Salop.*

Belfou, "Robert le Sire de," l. 13,558.—Here we have a baptismal name to assist us, and as Guillaume de Poitiers also calls him Robert, I adopt it, merely observing that Le Prévost states he is called Ralf in some contemporary documents, and that we find a Radulph de Bellofago in Domesday. The modern lists have Raoul and William.

Beaufou, Beaufoi, or Belfai, latinised Bellofagus, is in the neighbourhood of Pont-l'Evêque. Its lords were descended in female line from Ralph, Comte d'Ivri, uterine brother of Duke Richard I., already mentioned (page 220, *ante*); and Sir Henry Ellis, in his "Introduction to Domesday," suggests that the Radulphus of that book was a near relation, if not a son, of William de Beaufoe, Bishop of Thetford, Chaplain and Chancellor of the Conqueror. I consider him more likely to have been the son of Robert, the combatant of Senlac, and nephew of William the Bishop. No particulars are known of either, and except through females no descendants are traceable in England.

Cailly, "Sire de," l. 13,649.—Cailly is in the arrondissement of Rouen, and there can be no doubt that

* Not one of the last seven names occurs in the modern catalogues.

one or more of the family may have been in the expedition. Osbern de Cailly was apparently the holder of the fief in 1066, as his son Roger made a donation to St. Ouen in 1080. A William de Cailgi also appears in Domesday. Although by alliances with the Giffards and the Tateshalls they became of importance in England, the companion of the Conqueror has afforded no materials for a memoir. By the death of Thomas de Cailly, Baron of Buckenham (10th Edw. II.), without issue, the property passed, through his sister and heir Margaret, to the family of Clifton.

CARTRAI, "Onfroi and Maugier," l. 13,584.—Carteret, in the arrondissement of Valognes, imparted its name to this family, from a branch of which, settled in Jersey, the Barons Carteret, and from the sisters and co-heirs of Robert, second Earl Granville, Viscount and Baron Carteret, who died without issue in 1776, descend the present Marquises of Bath and Tweeddale, and the Earls Dysart and Cowper. Of Humphrey and Maugier, the companions of the Conqueror, nothing is known but their names. That of Roger is added by the modern compilers. Regnaud de Carteret, son of an earlier Humphrey, accompanied Duke Robert the Magnificent to the Holy Land in 1035.

CHAIGNES, "le Sire de," l. 13,664.—Le Prévost derives

this family from Cahagnes, in the arrondissement de Bayeux, the lords of which were benefactors to the abbey of Grestein, in Normandy, and the priory of Lewes, in Sussex. The name also appears in Domesday, and with the addition of Guillaume in the modern lists.

COMBRAI, "cil de," l. 13,775.—Combrai is near Harcourt Thury, arrondissement of Falaise. We have no particulars respecting its earlier lords, nor any indication which of them was in the battle. The modern lists have Geoffrey.

EPINÉ, "cil de," l. 13,613.—All speculation even on who is indicated by this personage would be idle under present circumstances. There are numerous fiefs and communes so called, and unless, as M. le Prévost observes, we are to consider the name was latinized into De Spineto, we have no trace of the family in England.

FERTÉ, "li Sire de la," l. 13,707.—The authors of "Recherches sur le Domesday" have set at rest all doubts respecting this personage and the locality from which he derived his name. Under the head of ACHARDUS they state incidentally that, in 1066, Achard d'Ambrières, Henri de Domfront, and *Mathew de la Ferté Macé* brought eighty men-at-arms from le Passais-Normand to join the forces assembled by Duke

William for the conquest of England. We have here, therefore, the names of two other companions of the Conqueror, neither of whom is mentioned by M. de Magny or Delisle; William de la Ferté, who with Turgis de Tracie were governors of Maine in 1073, was perhaps of the same family. A William de Feritate (Ferté) held Weston and Stokes in Baroniæ from the Conquest of England (Testa de Neville, p. 286). A Sire de Ferté Macé, either Mathias or William, married a sister of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, and his son William is described as nephew of that worthy prelate in the charter of an Archbishop of Tours, temp. St. Louis. What sister of Odo, and by which father?

GASCIE, "cil de," l. 13,658.—Gacé, arrondissement of Argentan. It is not known who was Sire de Gacé in 1066. Raoul de Gacé, the instigator of the murder of Gilbert, Count of Eu, died childless before the Conquest, and his domains were seized by Duke William. The holder under him has not been discovered.

GLOS. See SAP.

GOVIZ, "cil de," l. 13,653.—Gouvix is in the arrondissement of Falaise, but no possessor of it is known at the time of the Conquest.

JORT, "cil de," l. 13,614.—Jort is a commune near Courci, arrondissement of Falaise. It had belonged to

Lesceline, Countess of Eu, but no possessor of it in 1066 is known to French antiquaries. It was probably held by some one under the De Courcis of that day, as they are named together "Cil de Courci è Cil de Jort."

LITHAIRE, "li Sire de," l. 13,554.—Lithaire, commune of Haye-du-Puits, in the Cotentin. Eudo al Chapel was lord of it in 1066; but Robert de Haie, who married Muriel, daughter and heir of Eudo, might have held under him (see p. 125, *ante*).

LA MARE, "Sire de," l. 13,555.—The name of this great Anglo-Norman family was derived from the fief of La Mare, at St. Opportune, arrondissement of Pontaudemer, where the castle was built on piles on the border of the lake, still called Grand-Mare. Lemare occurs in the Roll of Battle Abbey and Duchesne's List, and De la Mare in Leland's; but I cannot find a Hugues de la Mare, as suggested by Le Prévost, in any, no baptismal names being mentioned. The modern lists have Guillaume.

MOLEI, "le Sire de," l. 13,777.—The family name of the Sire de Molay, or Vieux-Molay, in the eleventh century, was Bacon, subsequently so illustrious in England; and it is presumed that a Guillaume Bacon, who in 1082 made donations to the Abbey of the Holy Trinity at Caen, wherein his sister had taken

the veil, is the Sire de Molai of the "Roman de Rou." A Richard Bacon, nephew of Ranulf, Earl of Chester, founded the priory of Roncester, county of Stafford. The family of the great Lord Chancellor and the premier baronets of England do not deduce their descent from the Norman lords of Molay, but from Grimbald, a cousin of William de Warren, whose great grandson, according to their genealogists, assumed the name of Bacon in Normandy.

Monceals, "La," l. 13,654.—There are several communes of the name of Monceaux in Normandy. Le Prévost considers the one in question is in the neighbourhood of Bayeux, and the seat of the family of Drogo de Monceaux, the second husband of Edith de Warren, widow of Gerrard de Gournay. Either Drogo or his son of the same name witnessed the foundation charter of Dunstable, in the county of Bedford, temp. Henry I., and the name is of frequent occurrence in later documents. Guillaume de Monceaux occurs in the modern lists.

Pacie, "cil ki ert Sire de," l. 13,655.—Paci-sur-Eure was, at the time of the Conquest, in the possession of William Fitz Osbern, and after his death, in 1074, formed a portion of the inheritance of William de Breteuil, his son. M. le Prévost denounces this as an evident mistake, but some one may have held under

Fitz Osbern, though not entitled perhaps to be called the "*Sire* de Paci."

PIROU, "un Chevalier de," l. 13,557.—Pirou is near Lessai, but "a chevalier of Pirou" might not be the lord of it. It would be idle to speculate as to the person alluded to by the poet. William, Lord of Pirou, is said by Orderic to have perished in the fatal wreck of the "White Ship," in 1120. In a later charter, however, a "Gulielmus de Pirou, Dapifer," appears as a witness.—Mon. Ang. vol. ii., p. 973.

PRAERES, "le Sire de," l. 13,661.—Even the locality of this seigneurie is undetermined, and when it is stated that a Sire de Praeres appears about 1119 as a vassal of the Earl of Chester, all is said that is known of the family.

PINS, "cil ki ert Sire des," l. 13,567, supposed to be Pin au Haras, arrondissement of Argentan. A Foulques des Pin is named in a charter to Saint Pierre-sur-Dive as a contemporary of the Conqueror; a Morin du Pin was Dapifer to Robert, Comte de Mortain, and living in 1080, and the name frequently occurs in connection with events of the next century; but the Sire des Pins of Senlac has not been identified. The family were seated in England shortly after the Conquest, and appear to have been in the service of the Counts of Meulent (*Orderic Vital*, 687, 881).

REBERCIL, "le Sire de," l. 13,777.—Now called Rubercy, in the arrondissement of Bayeux. The companion of the Conqueror not known, but in 1168 Hughes Wae (Wake), Lord of Rebercil, founded the Abbey of Longues, and the family of Wake is one of the most important in Anglo-Norman history. How he became Lord of Rebercil, whether by inheritance or marriage, has yet to be discovered. His wife was Emma, daughter of Baldwin de Gant and Adelaide de Rullos; but Hugh could not have been born at the time of the Conquest, and we have no knowledge of his father. No connection is hinted to have existed between Hugh and the celebrated Hereward, whose name of Le Wake is of dubious derivation; but the founding of the Priory of Brunne in Lincolnshire by Baldwin de Gant, the father-in-law of Hugh, is worthy of observation, taken in connection with the story that Hereward was a son of Leofric, Lord of Brunne. The name of Wake occurs in all the Rolls and catalogues except those of MM. de Magny and Delisle, and the Wakes of Clevedon, in the county of Somerset, claim to be descended from Sir Thomas, called from his large possessions "the great Wake" in the reign of Edward III.

SAINT CLER, "le Sire de," l. 13,749.—Saint Clair is the principal town in the canton of that name in the

arrondissement of St. Lô. The site of the castle was still to be seen near the church when M. de Gerville wrote his valuable work on the castles in La Manche. A William de Saint Clair was a benefactor to the Abbey of Savigny in the reign of Henry I., and one of the same name, if not the same person, founded the Priory of Villiers Fossard in 1139; but who "came over with the Conqueror" does not appear. A Richard de *Sencler* is found in Domesday, from whom, as a matter of course, the English Sinclairs are reported to have descended.

ST. MARTIN, "le Sire de," l. 13,565.—No identification either of place or person. There are very many St. Martins, and we know nothing of their seigneurs in 1066. A family of that name was seated in England early in the following century, and a Robert de St. Martin founded the Abbey of Robert's Bridge, in the county of Sussex, in 1176.

SAINT SEVER, "cil de."—Le Prévost doubts the existence of any seigneur of Saint Sever in 1066, that place having been always the property of the Viscounts of the Avranchin. Now "Saint Sever! Sire St. Sever!" was the war cry of Renouf de Bricasard at the battle of Val-ès-Dunes (see vol. i., p. 29), and his son Ranulph de Bricasard, called Le Meschin, or the younger, afterwards Earl of Chester, would have pro-

bably been the Lord of St. Sever at the time of the expedition had he been old enough, but as he lived till 1129 that is not probable. At all events the learned antiquary is, I think, mistaken. Renouf de Bricasard was Viscount of the *Bessin* in 1047, not of the Avranchin, and therefore frequently called Renouf de Bayeux. He married Matilda, daughter of Richard d'Avranches, by Emma de Conteville, and sister of Hugh, Earl of Chester. That is the only connection with the Vicomtes d'Avranches, which, supposing him to be married in 1047, might account in some way for his war cry. We have no means of ascertaining the age of either father or son in 1066; but as Neel de Saint-Sauveur, the other rebellious viscount, was in the expedition, the odds are in favour of the elder son-in-law of that "Richarz ki fu d'Avrancin" (see p. 16, *ante*), under whom he might have held St. Sever, or been enfeoffed with it in frank marriage at the time of his union with his daughter.

SAP, "cil de," l. 13,668.—Wace couples with "cil de Sap," "cil de Gloz," upon which Le Prévost remarks: "Here again are two seigneurs of our author's creation. At the time of the Conquest Sap had been given with Moules to Baldwin Fitz Gilbert, Comte de Brionne, as we have already said, and could not consequently have a 'seigneur particulier.' As to Gloz,

it belonged to William de Breteuil, and it appears that its possession dated from a very early period, because we find Barnon de Glos in the service of his (William's) father about the year 1035. William de Gloz, son of this Barnon, was dapifer to William de Breteuil, and assisted probably at the Conquest in that capacity." Exactly so, and therefore why, dear M. le Prévost, to whom we are all so much indebted, do you charge the honest Prebend of Bayeux with having created two "seigneurs" out of his imagination? The title is of your own bestowing. He does not style them seigneurs. He speaks of them simply as "*cil* de Sap," and "*cil* de Gloz" (celui), and the context clearly shows that he does not rank them as lords of a fief, but as chevaliers distinguished by their family names, who in later days in England would have been called Sir William de Gloz, and Sir — de Sap. Sire not only signified lord, but the senior member of the family ("plus vieux, plus ancien," Ménage), and was familiarly applied to men of any rank ("pauvre sire, homme sans mérite," Landais). Granting that Wace may have occasionally used it inaccurately, the persistence of his annotator in refusing to recognize the existence of the persons so designated is, I humbly submit, a mistake on his part.

SACIE, "cil de," l. 13,659.—M. de Gerville, in his "Recherches sur les Châteaux de la Manche," has pointed out that the place here mentioned is not Sassy near Falaise, but Sacey near Pont Orson. A Jourdain de Sacey, chevalier, was living in the twelfth century, and an Emeric de Sacey occurs in the "Monasticon," but no guess has been made as to the actual companion of the Conqueror. I will venture a suggestion. In the Commune of Sacey, on the banks of the Coesnon, a river dividing the provinces of Normandy and Brittany, a castle was built in 1030 by Robert Duke of Normandy, father of the Conqueror, the site of which was, and may be still, visible on a hill about a quarter of a league from the bourg of Sassy. This castle, indifferently called Charruez and Cheruel, is said to have given its name to the well-known Norman family of Kyriel. Wace makes no mention of a Kyriel, but if one of the family held lands in the commune he might have been known as a Sire de Sassy. *Vide* Recherches de M. de Gerville, and Sir Bernard Burke's Roll of Battle Abbey.

SAINTEALS, "cil de," l. 13,643.—This commune, now called Cintheaux, near Gonvix, arrondissement de Falaise, offers no record of a possessor in 1066. In 1081 it belonged to Robert Marmion, who gave the church there to the Abbey of Barbery. One of that

family may have been an under-tenant at the time of the Conquest.

SEMILLIE, "li Sire de," l. 13,650.—A Guillaume de Semilly (near St. Lô) is a witness to two charters in 1082, and appears to have been a person of some importance, as he signs immediately after Odo Bishop of Bayeux and Roger de Montgomeri. He was probably the "Sire de Semillie" of Senlac. His daughter and heiress, Agnes, married Guillaume, son of Richard de Hommet, Constable of Normandy, and their eldest son Guillaume assumed the family name of his mother, granting as Guillaume de Semilly a hundred acres of land in his demesnes to the Abbey of Aunay, with the consent of his brothers, Jourdain, Bishop of Lisieux, Geoffrey and Enguerrand du Hommet (Recherches sur le Domesday, p. 94).

SOLIGNIE, "le Sire de," l. 13,602.—Subligny, near Avranches. According to Le Prévost (Corrections and Additions to vol. ii.), one of this family, who wrote themselves Sulligny, Sousligny, and Subligny, became Bishop of Avranches, and another took part in the first crusade. A marriage with the Paniells, or Paganels, caused the property of a branch in Normandy to pass into that family, and the name of Subligny existed in the counties of Cornwall, Devon, and Somerset as late as the present century. The

companion of the Conqueror, however, has yet to be identified.

TOUQUES, "eil de," l. 13,555.—A place at the mouth of the river of that name, arrondissement of Pont-l'Evêque. Mons. le Prévost notices the appearance of the names of Jordan, Roger, Robert, and Henri de Touques in Dugdale's Monasticon; but neither he nor Mr. Edgar Taylor seems to have been aware of the ancient family of Toke of Godington, in the county of Kent, who claim descent from the companion of the Conqueror. Thoroton, who spells the name in seventeen different ways, states that a branch of this family was seated in Nottinghamshire in the reign of Rufus, and other ramifications may be found in the counties of Derby, York, Cambridge, Herts, and Dorset. The present representative of the house is the Rev. Nicholas Toke, of Godington, near Ashford.

TORNEOR, "Sire del," l. 13,661.
TORNIÈRES, "Sire de," l. 13,664. } Of the Sire of Le Tourneur, near Vire, or his comrade the Sire of Tournières, arrondissement of Bayeux, nothing is known by either the French or the English annotators of Wace. A Richard de Tourneriis is mentioned in the foundation charter of Kenilworth, temp. Henry I., and the Earl of Winterton claims to be descended from a Sire de Tournour who came over with the Conqueror.

TRACIE, "Sire de," l. 13,605.—The Norman family of Tracy does not appear to have been of much importance in England before the reign of Stephen, who bestowed upon Henry de Tracy the honour of Benstable (Barnstaple) in Devonshire; but the first of the name we hear of is Turgis, or Turgisins de Tracy, who with William de la Ferté was defeated and driven out of Maine by Fulk le Rechin, Count of Anjou, in 1073, and who was therefore in all probability the Sire de Tracy in the army at Hastings. Tracy is in the neighbourhood of Vire, arrondissement of Caen, and the ruins of a magnificent castle of the middle ages were and may still be seen there. In 1082 a charter was subscribed at Tracy by a William de Traci and his nephew Gilbert (Gallia Christina, xi. Instrum. p. 107), one or the other being most likely the son of Turgis, and the father of Henry of Barnstaple.

The name of Tracy is principally known to the readers of English history from the unenviable notoriety of a William de Tracy, one of the cowardly murderers of Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 1170; but his connection with the main line is obscure, as in his charter granting to the Canons of Torre, in the county of Devon, all his lands at North Chillingford, he writes himself William de Traci, son

of Gervase de Courtenay, whose name I do not find in the pedigree of that house.

TREGOZ, "cil ki done tenoit," l. 13,669.—Tregoz is in the arrondissement of St. Lô. The ruins of a castle were existing lately at the confluence of the Vire and the brook of Marqueran, but the name of him "who then held Tregoz" is unknown to me. Mr. Edgar Taylor, in his notes to Wace, says "Jeffery de Tregoz would, according to Dugdale (Baronage, i., 615), be the probable contemporary of the Conquest." What he founds that opinion upon I am at a loss to discover. The first Geoffrey de Tregoz mentioned by Dugdale was the son of a William de Tregoz, who in 1131 had the lands of William Peverel of London in farm, and therefore even he could not have been old enough in 1066 to have fought at Senlac, where Wace tells us that "he who then held Tregoz" killed two Englishmen, transfixing one with his lance and cleaving the skull of the other with his sword, and galloping back unwounded by the enemy. It may have been the father of that William who performed that exploit; but Dugdale takes us no higher than William. A Robert de Tregoz was Sheriff of Wiltshire and a distinguished warrior in the time of Richard I., and the name has descended to us in his old place of residence in the above county—Ledyard-Tregose.

TROSSEBOT, l. 13,711.—This name is coupled with that of Botevîlain by Wace as two warriors who feared neither cut nor thrust, fighting furiously that day, and giving and receiving severe blows. M. le Prévost could not, however, trace the origin of this family in Normandy, and a William Troussebot is first brought to our notice in the reign of Henry I. by Orderic Vital, who includes him amongst the men of low origin, whom for their obsequious services that sovereign raised to the rank of nobles, raising them as it were from the dust, heaping wealth upon them, and exalting them above earls and noble lords of castles (lib. xi. cap. 2). The Troussebots are supposed to have been resident in the north-western part of the district of Neubourg, near the domain of Robert de Harcourt, whose daughter Albreda became the wife of William Trussbot above mentioned, son of Geoffrey and grandson of Pagan Troussebot, who in all probability was the combatant at Senlac.

Geoffrey Fitz Payne, as he is called, was seated before the reign of Henry I. at Wartre in Holderness, in the county of York, and the family was thenceforth styled the Trusbutts of Wartre. The male line failed by the death of the three sons of William without issue, and their three sisters, Rose, Hillarie, and Agatha, became heirs of the estates. The two latter dying childless,

the whole property devolved upon William de Ros, grandson of Rose, who married Everard de Ros, a great baron in Holderness, who assumed the allusive coat of Trussbot of Wartre: three water-bougets. "Trois bouts d'eau," or three bougets of *water*.

URINIE, "cil d'," l. 13,705.—Supposed to be Origny, of which name there are two communes in Normandy, one near Belesme, and the other near Mamers, but nothing has been learned respecting the person alluded to.

VITRIE, "cil de," l. 13,604.—Robert Seigneur de Vitré (Ille-et-Vilaine), grandson of Rivallon-le-Vicaire, is stated by the historians of Brittany to have been the person who is indicated by Wace. Of him or his deeds we have no record.

André de Vitry married Agnes, daughter of Robert Comte de Mortain (vol. i., p. 114), and consequently niece to the Conqueror. We have not the date, but as her younger sister Denise was married in 1078, it appears doubtful to me if Robert, son of Agnes, could have been old enough to have fought at Senlac in 1066. The annalist of the family of Vitré states that on Robert's birth his grandfather (the Comte de Mortain) came to Vitré, and at his baptism gave him his name and all the land he held in Trugny, Nicey, and Vercreuil in Normandy. An inference might be

drawn from this that Robert was born after the Conquest.

His son Robert, called the younger, married Emma, daughter of Alan de Dinan, and their only daughter, Eleanora de Vitré, married, 1st, William, son of Fulk Painel, 2ndly, Gilbert de Tillières, and 3rdly, William Fitz Patrick, second Earl of Salisbury, whom she also survived, and married 4thly Gilbert de Malmaines, outlived him, and died in 1233. She is generally stated to have been the mother of Ela, sole daughter and heir of her third husband, the Earl of Salisbury, and wife of William de Longuespée, son of the celebrated "Fair Rosamond," by Henry II. I have contested that descent elsewhere, but it is not necessary to repeat my arguments in these pages. I have only to do here with the companion of the Conqueror, who I take to have been André, the husband of his niece, and not their son Robert, who, if even born, must have been a child at that period.

Only one out of the last twenty names, viz., that of "Tracy," occurs in the compilations of Messrs. de Magny and Delisle.

One word at parting—I lay down my pen with a feeling of regret that I have been unable to throw

more light upon the many perplexing points which are forced upon our consideration in pursuing these inquiries, by the silence or contradiction of the contemporary writers to whom we naturally turn for authentic information. In venturing to differ with some of the most erudite of the present day, I have raised, however, a few questions which will no doubt be either at once conclusively answered, or if deemed worthy of attention, lead to further investigation, with probably interesting results. I have no desire to awaken controversies which end in convincing nobody, and too often offend somebody. The great object we have all at heart is truth, and I can sincerely adopt the words of my old friend and master, the late Sir Samuel Rush Meyrick, who was wont to say, "the greatest pleasure any one can give me, next to proving me to be right, is kindly showing me where I am wrong."

INDEX.

	Vol. 1.	Vol. 2.
Abetot		150
Abeville or Apeville		277
Aigle		159
Aincourt		236
Albini		90
Ansneville		239
Asnebec		280
Asnières		280
Aulnay		203
Aunou		132
Auvilliers		281
Avranches		16
Bayeux, Odo Bishop of		88
Beauchamp		172
Beaumont		203
Belfou		283
Bertram		247
Bertran		281
Biarz		198
Bienfaite		33
Bigod		54
Bohun		63
Bonnebosq		282
Botevilain		282
Boulogne, Eustace Count of	148	
Bretagne, Counts Alain of	264	
Brevere	127	
Briencourt		282
Cailly		283
Cartrai		284
Chaignes		284
Champagne, Odo Count of	118	
Chapel, Eudo al		124
Columbières		251
Combrai		285
Courci		83
Coutances, Geoffrey Bishop of		25
Crèvecœur		242
Crispin		191
Dapifer (Eudo)		126
Epiné		285
Estouteville		253
Eu, Count of	257	
Evreux, Count of	248	
Ferrers		66
Ferté		285
Fitz Erneis		185
Fitz Osbern	173	
Fitz Rou, Toustain (Le Blanc)	227	
Fougeres		225
Gael		1
Gascie		286
Giffard	160	
Glos		286
Gournay		109
Goviz		286
Grentmesnil		75
Harcourt		229
Ivri		220
Jort		286
Lacy		153
La Lande (Patry)		187
La Mare		287
La Val	145	
Lithaire		287
Malet		94
Mandeville		73
Marmion		167
Meules		40
Mohun		120
Molei		287
Monceals		288
Montfort	167	

	Vol. 1.	Vol. 2.
Montfichet		49
Montgomeri	181	
Mortagne	261	
Mortain, Count of	107	
Mortemer	232	
Moulins		106
Mowbray		25
Nevil		134
Oiley		213
Pacie		288
Painel		234
Percy		182
Peverel		258
Pins		289
Pirou		289
Port		249
Praeres		289
Rebercil		290
Redvers		45
Roumare		144
Sacie		294
St. Cler		290
Sainteals		294
St. Martin		291
St. Sauveur		140
St. Sever		291
St. Valeri		207
Sap		292
Say		244
Semillie		295
Solignie		295
Taisson, or Tesson		104
Tankerville		148
Thouars	242	
Toeni	217	
Torneor		296
Tornières		296
Touques		296
Toustain le Blanc (Fitz Rou)	227	
Tracie		297
Tregoz		298
Trossebot		299
Urinie		300
Vesci		157
Vieuxpont		99
Vitrie		300
Warren	131	
William the Conqueror	1	
——— Family of	77	

THE END.

BRADBURY, AGNEW, & CO., PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018